26

BHĀMAHA AND HIS KĀVYĀLAṄKĀRA

By

BATUK NĀTH S'ARMĀ, M. A., SĀHITYOPĀDHYĀYA,

and

BALDEVA UPĀDHYĀYA, M. A., SĀHITYA S'ĀSTRĪ,

PROFESSORS, BENARES HINDU UNIVERSITY.

I.—BHAMAHA AND HIS KAVYALANKĀRA.

BY BATUK NATH SARMA AND BALDEVA UPĀDHYĀYA.

PRELIMINARY.

In every age, in every clime, the importance of an author is weighed on the scales of utility by the coming posterity. Plato and Aristotle command no inconsiderable recognition and deference even now—in the age which has seen cultural progress in almost all directions. This is so, not only for the reason that their works were of the highest order, but also because they were made much use of by the generations coming after them. So it seems that in order to gauge the merits of a particular author we should betake ourselves to the consideration of the kind of fame which that author has had the good fortune to call his own.

IMPORTANCE OF भामह

Let us now turn to our own author and see whether he can stand the test successfully. Even a desultory student of Sanskrit Poetics can bear testimony to the fact that there are a few famous names of old eminent authors which no later writer on the subject could afford to ignore without sacrificing his own high ambition of celebrity. One of these such names is indeed that of भामह. As far as we know, there is no important work on Poetics which does not refer to भामह and his work in some way or other. His work has been very frequently drawn upon for quotations by almost all the important writers of Sanskrit Poetics. There are some who have even borrowed from his works 'matter' and sometimes phraseology. In the body of discussions he has been referred to as an authority of necessary recognition. Even those who could not manage to agree with him on certain points have shown due deference to his views. He has been commanding this respect from Sanskrit poets and poeticians, not for a century or two, but for a very large number of centuries. The name which seems to have been most associated with the science of poetics from its early infancy (with the only exception of भरत) is that of भामह. He is indeed the oldest आलङ्कारिक and in fact one of the most authoritative ones whose work has come down to us.

Not only the old writers of India have had much to do with भामह and his work, even the modern scholars of vast erudition and wide reputation, have been attracted towards him. There was a time when a regular warfare was going on, with regard to the date and personality of भामह, among some of the leaders of Oriental Research in India, in which some western scholars of note also took part. Though nothing perfectly quite definite was arrived at, still much was written which shed new light on some obscure corners of historical investigation.

A BRIEF SURVEY OF DISCUSSIONS ON भामह

It would not be out of place to take here a very brief survey of the various problems raised and discussed with regard to भामह along with the conclusion reached by way of their solutions. Though, as noted above, भामह's name was to be heard everywhere among scholars, his work was not at first available anywhere. Bühler, not finding any trace of भामह's work, inferred, with the inevitable disappointment of a real scholar, that the work had been lost for over.[1] In 1880, however, a MS of the work came to the notice of Gustav Oppert but we could not know much from his description.[2] In his memorable list of works on Sanskrit Poetics, Jacob noted the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह also,[3] but even this mention was not of much use. In the edition of a certain Kanarese work[1] on Poetics, Mr. K. B. Pathak also took notice of this work but it was only in passing and had nothing directly to do with it. The first person to give publicity to भामह's work and to make definite statements about him, was R. Narsimhachar of Bangalore. In the Introduction to his edition of a Kannada work[2] on Poetics he observed—"Next to him (Bhārata) in point of time, comes Bhāmaha whose priority to Daṇḍin is proved by the latter criticising his views in the first chapter of Kāvyādarśa. He is one of the greatest authorities on Poetics, his view being quoted by almost all the subsequent writers of note on the subject............Prof. Rangacharya M.A. of the Madras Presidency College has had the good fortune to come upon the manuscript of the valuable and long-sought-after work. .. ..The work bears no date but the author probably belongs to the early part of the 6th century." But as this was written in the Introduction of a Kannada work, it could not naturally come to the notice of most of the Sanskrit scholars.

---

[1] Bühler's Kāshmir Report, 1877.

[2] List of Sanskrit MSS. in private Libraries of Southern India, Vol. I. No. 3731.

[3] J. R. A. S. 1897-8.

It was only when Mr. M. T. Narsinhiengar wrote an article on भामह that the attention of Sanskrit scholars was drawn towards the great rhetorician[3]. Mr. Narsimhiengar raised almost all those issues which engaged the attention of Indologists for a long time later on. He thought that भामह was a Buddhist and flourished after दण्डी. Dr. Barnett, in that very year, wrote a note, supporting Mr. Narsimhiengar that भामह belonged to the first half of the 8th century[4]. Mr. P. V. Kāṇe tried to refute

---

1. कविराजमार्ग edt. by K. B. Pathak, 1898.
2. काव्यावलोकनम् by नागवर्मा, edt. by R. Narsimhachar, 1903.
3. J. R. A. S., 1905, p. 535 ff.
4. J. R. A. S., 1905, p. 841.

Mr. Narsimhiengar's hypothesis that भामह was a Buddhist, but as regards his date, he agreed with him[1] In 1909 विद्यानाथ's प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण was published by Mr. K P. Trivedi in the Bombay Sanskrit Series. In an 'Appendix' to this work, भामह's काव्यालङ्कार appeared in print for the first time. Mr. Trivedi, in his learned Introduction, dealt with many questions in connection with भामह. His arguments were mainly directed against the views of Mr. Narsimhiengar. Dr. Jacobi[2] and Prof. Rangacharya[3] in 1910 and Mr. Anantacharya[4] in 1911 joined issue and mainly agreed with Mr. Trivedi. Mr. R. Narsimhachar (the first person to give publicity to the discovery of भामह's work) added some new arguments to those already advanced in favour of the priority of भामह to दण्डी. [5]In the same year Mr. K. B. Pathak tried in a learned paper to refute many of the arguments put forward against him[6]. But his refutations, as shown by Mr. Trivedi the very next year, were as unconvincing as they were learned[7]. This paper of Mr. Trivedi seems to have silenced his opponents, and for a number of years nothing new was added to this important discussion. In 1922, Dr. Jacobi, with his characteristic insight in all matters connected with Indology, suggested a new line of approach to the determination of भामह's date (as did also Mr. P. V. Kane, quite independently of Dr. Jacobi). He tried to prove that भामह had borrowed much from धर्मकीर्ति and that consequently he must be

---

1. J. R. A. S., 1908, p. 543.
2. Z. D. M. G., 1910.
3. Introduction to काव्यादर्श, 1910.
4. Brahmavadin, 1911.
5. Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 90 ff.
6. Int. Ant., 1912, p. 232 ff.
7. Ind. Ant., 1913.

placed after him[1]. To many this view appeared to be the last word in the discussion on the date of भामह. Dr. De[2] and others[3] seem to have followed in the foot-steps of Jacobi.

The last few years have seen a marked progress towards the study of Sanskrit Poetics and a few very valuable works have appeared on the subject. Mr. P. V. Kane deserves all praise for his intensive study and extensive researches[4]. Dr. S. K. De also is entitled to an especial mention. He has rendered a valuable service to the cause of the study of the History of Sanskrit Poetics by his useful work[5]. Dr. Nobel's recently published book[6] and Mr. B. N. Bhattacharya's paper[7] are also not to be lost sight of.

In spite of so much writing, no attempt has so far been made to see if it is possible to throw any new light on the subject nor even to sum up in one place all that has been written before. भामह's work itself has till now been lying in a neglected condition in an obscure corner of प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण।

An attempt is, therefore, being made here to present within the limits of a brief paper every information hitherto available regarding भामह and his work, and in course of this presentation, to examine critically the current theories and to see if any of them is compatible with the date recently brought to light. It is to be earnestly hoped that this humble attempt on our part will again remind the veteran scholars of their old friend भामह and will probably help to create for them a new interest in him.

---

[1] Sitzungberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 211-12.

[2] History of Sanskrit Poeties, Vol. 1, p. 48.

[3] Nobel.—Foundations of Indian Poetry, p. 17.

[4] Introduction to his edition of साहित्यदर्पण, Bombay, 1923.

[5] History of Sanskrit Poetries, 2 Vols., 1923.

[6] Foundations of Indian Poetry, Calcutta, 1925.

[7] Calcutta Journal of Letters, Vol. IX.

भामह—WHO AND WHAT HE WAS

We know very little with regard to भामह except what we find revealed in his काव्यालङ्कार. Tradition says that he was a Kashmirian, and this is believed in by Bühler[1] and others[2]. There is no reason to disbelieve it even though we have no reasonable evidence—external or internal—to prove it beyond doubt. From the last śloka[3] of his काव्यालङ्कार, we learn that his name was भामह and that he was the son of रक्रिलगोमिन्. The word रक्रिल, which bears phonetic resemblance to राहुल, पोत्तल, सोमिल and similar other Buddhist names, is alleged to suggest Buddhistic associations; and this suggestion would seem to gain strength from a consideration of the term गोमिन् which is reminiscent of the name of one of Buddha's disciples[4]. Mr. Pathak has shown that the word गोमिन् used to carry with it an idea of reverence[5]. He refers to a sutra of the चान्द्रव्याकरण[6] where the word is expressly stated to convey such a sense. Moreover, the word सार्वसर्वज्ञ which occurs in the opening śloka[7] of भामह's work, cannot but point, so it is said, to the Buddha himself. The word सार्व in its derivative meaning stands quite in correspondence with the doctrine of universal love taught by Buddha. हेमचन्द्र[1] gives सार्व as one of the names of जिन. जिनदेवमुनीश्वर[2] does exactly the same thing, except that he adds to the list of the synonyms the name सर्वीय. In view of the well known fact that several Buddhist names were adopted by the Jains, one might feel justified in inferring from these Jain references that सार्व was originally an epithet of the Buddha. The use of the word सर्वज्ञ for Buddha[3] is, of course, well known.

---

[1] Bühler's Kashmir Report, p. 64.

[2] Narsimhachar in his Introduction to नागवर्मा's काव्यावलोकनम् Ind. Ant., 1912.
Krishnamacharya : History of Classical Sanskrit Literature.

[3] अवलोक्य मतानि सत्कवीनामवगम्य स्वधिया च काव्यलक्ष्म ।
सुजनावगमाय भामहेन ग्रथितं रक्रिलगोमिसूनुनेदम् ॥ काव्या० VI,64.

[4] J. R. A. S., 1905

[5] Ind. Ant., 1912.

[6] 'गोमिन् पूज्ये', 4. II. 144.

[7] प्रणम्य सार्वं सर्वज्ञं मनोवाक्कायकर्मभिः ।
काव्यालङ्कार इत्येष यथाबुद्धि वधास्यते ॥ काव्या-I. I.

Now taking these points into consideration, we may at once confess that the arguments, stated above for proving भामह to be a Buddhist, do not by themselves stand on a very firm ground. As says Mr. Kāṇe, there is not much in a name.[4] When the Hindus and the Buddhists had been living in the same country for centuries and centuries together, there is no wonder if one borrowed the name of the other. When this fact is found to be possible even in the case of such heterogenous peoples as the Hindus and the Mahomedans, it is even more possible in the case of the Hindus and the Buddhists. Moreover, we are to remember that Buddha himself had come to be recognised as an अवतार of विष्णु, certainly before the 11th century. With Trivedi, we may add that the word गोस्मिन् is not exclusively used for the Buddhists. It is explained by the नैघण्टुकs as a contraction of गोस्वामिन्. It is a caste designation added after the names of the Brāhmaṇas

---

1. अभिधान चिन्तामणि, I,1, 25.
2. अभिधान चिन्ताशिलोञ्छ.
3. सर्वज्ञः सुगतो बुद्धः—अमरकोश
4. Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p. XVIII.

throughout Kashmir and Northern India and corresponds to the आचार्य of the South.[1]

An author's religion may perhaps be judged from the contents of his book, but not from his name. In the whole of काव्यालङ्कार there is nothing peculiarly Buddhistic, nor is there any reference to the incidents of Buddha's life or to any purely Buddhistic legends. The first verse, no doubt, salutes सार्व सर्वज्ञ but the appellation सार्व simply means सर्वस्मै हित[2] and is not given by any lexicographer as meaning Buddha exclusively. The word सर्वज्ञ is found in lexicons standing for Buddha as well as for Śiva[3]. कुमारिल in his श्लोकवार्तिक devotes a long section to the refutation of "सर्वज्ञ", where he means by the term "Omniscient God" and not "Buddha." It is a significant fact that अमरसिंह, who was himself a Buddhist, does nowhere give the word सार्व for Buddha in his अमरकोश।

The अपोहवाद of the Buddhists, which represents their theory of verbal connotation, is criticised by भामह in a language which cannot be considered possible for a Buddhist[4] writer.

---

[1] See Trivedi's Introduction to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण p. xxxvii.

[2] हितप्रकरणे णं च सर्वशब्दात् प्रयुञ्जते ।
ततश्छमिष्टया च यथा सार्वः सर्वीय इत्यपि ॥
काव्या°—VI, 53.

Cf. पाणिनि ' सर्वपुरुषाभ्यां णढञौ ' V. 1. 10. also.

[3] कृशानुरेताः सर्वज्ञो धूर्जटिर्नीललोहितः-अमरकोश.

[4] अन्यापोहेन शब्दोऽर्थमाहेत्यन्ये प्रचक्षते ।
अन्यापोहश्च नामान्यपदार्थापाकृतिः किल ॥
यदि गौरित्ययं शब्दः कृतार्थोऽन्यनिराकृतौ ।
जनको गवि गोबुद्धेर्मृग्यतामपरो ध्वनिः ॥
काव्या°—VI, 16-17.

He speaks of Vedic rites and ceremonies in very high terms. The kings who drank Soma are highly spoken of[1]. Most of his examples refer to Brahmanical gods[2] and heroes. The famous Paurāṇic legend of the burning of काम by शिव has been referred to by भामह in very clear terms[3]. He very frequently alludes to the characters and incidents of रामायण. The meeting of राम with परशुराम[4], his exile to the forest of दण्डक in obedience to the orders of his father[5], his piercing with a single arrow the seven ताल trees[6], the promise of हनुमान् to search out the whereabouts of सीता[7]—these are some of the famous incidents of रामायण mentioned by भामह in his काव्यालङ्कार.

---

[1] भुञ्जतां पीतसोमानां न्याय्ये वर्त्मनि तिष्ठताम् ।
अलङ्करिष्णुना वंशं गुरौ सति जिगीषुणा ॥ काव्या०-IV.48.

[2] युगादौ भगवान् ब्रह्मा विनिर्मित्सुरिव प्रजाः । काव्या०-II.55 b.
समग्रगगनायाममानदण्डो रथाङ्गिनः ।
पादो जयति सिद्धस्त्रीमुखेन्दुनवदर्पणः ॥ काव्या०-III. 36.
विदधानौ किरीटेन्दू श्यामाभ्रहिमसच्छवी ।
रथाङ्गशूले बिभ्राणौ पातां वः शम्भुशार्ङ्गिणौ ॥ काव्या०-IV.21.
कान्ते इन्दुशिरोरत्ने आदधाने उदंशुनी ।
पातां वः शम्भुशर्वाण्यौ……………॥ काव्या०-IV.27.

[3] स एकस्त्रीणि जयति जगन्ति कुसुमायुधः ।
हरतापि तनुं यस्य शम्भुना न हृतं बलम् । काव्या०-III. 25.

[4] अत्याजयद्यथा रामः सर्वक्षत्रवधाश्रयाम् ।
जामदग्न्यं युधा जित्वा सा ज्ञेया कोपबाधिनी ॥ काव्या०-V.44.

[5] उदात्तशक्तिमान् रामो गुरुवाक्यानुरोधकः ।
विहायोपनतं राज्यं यथा वनमुपागमत ॥ काव्या०-III. 11.

[6] रामः सप्ताभिनत् तालान् । काव्या०-III. 32.

[7] उपलप्स्ये स्वयं सीतामिति भर्तुर्निदेशतः ।
हनूमता प्रतिज्ञाय सा ज्ञातेत्यर्थसंश्रया ॥ काव्या०-IV. 37.

The references to the characters and incidents of महाभारत are far more numerous than those of रामायण. Almost all the important characters of महाभारत are found mentioned[1]. The promise of पुरु to suffer the miseries of old age in lieu of his father[2], and that of भीष्म for the life of a perfect celibate[3], have been alluded to by भामह, while illustrating different types of प्रतिज्ञा. Similarly, the gambling duel of युधिष्ठिर and शकुनि,[4], the terrible determination and performance of the drinking of दुःशासन's blood[5], and many other incidents[6] are also referred to. In a truly beautiful śloka, भामह describes the feeling of excessive joy expressed by विदुर on कृष्ण's arrival at his house[7]. In another śloka, the name of प्रद्युम्न, the son of कृष्ण, is found coupled with that of ऐल पुरूरवा, the progenitor of the lunar dynasty of Kṣatriyas[8].

---

1. See भामह's काव्यालङ्कार, III. 7, V. 31, V. 41.
2. जरामेष बिभर्मीति प्रतिज्ञाय पितुर्यथा
   तथैव पुरुणाभारि सा स्याद्धर्मनिबन्धिनी ॥ V. 36.
3. अद्यारभ्य निवत्स्यामि मुनिवद् वचनादिति
   पितुः प्रियाय यां भीष्मश्चक्रे सा कामबाधिनी ॥ V. 36.
4. आहूतो न निवर्तेय द्यूतायेति युधिष्ठिरः
   कृत्वा सन्धां शकुनिना दिदेवेत्यर्थबाधिनी ॥ V. 42.
5. भ्रातुर्भ्रातृव्यमुन्मथ्य पास्याम्यस्यासृगाहवे
   प्रतिज्ञाय यथा भीमस्तच्चकारावशो रुषा ॥ V. 39.
6. See काव्यालङ्कार, II. 41, V. 41.
7. ···गृहागतं कृष्णमवादीद्विदुरो यथा ॥
   अद्य या मम गोविन्द जाता त्वयि गृहागते
   कालेनैषा भवेत् प्रीतिस्तवैवागमनात् पुनः ॥ III. 5.
8. भरतस्त्वं दिलीपस्त्वं त्वमेवैलः पुरूरवाः
   त्वमेव वीर प्रद्युम्नस्त्वमेव नरवाहनः ॥ V. 59.

Besides these references to the रामायण and the महाभारत, there are obvious allusions to the stories of उदयन, the king of the Vatsas, and of his son, नरवाहनदत्त, as described in the बृहत्कथा of गुणाढ्य.[1] चाणक्य, the celebrated prime minister to चन्द्रगुप्तमौर्य, has been mentioned as going at night to the pleasure-house of king नन्द.[2]

Bearing in mind all these facts, we really wonder how a person professing a particular religion, should, when writing an important work, have totally forgotten his own religion and betaken himself always to another for illustrations. There is no dearth of legendary stories among the Buddhists. Had he so wished, he could have easily drawn upon them. This fact becomes quite clear on looking into the works of नमिसाधु and others, where it is found that all illustrations are taken from their own religious legends. Not only this. At times, in refuting अपोहवाद for instance, he becomes a bit aggressive to the pet ideas of the Buddhists. If we remember what the influence of the Buddhists was before the advent of श्रीशङ्कराचार्य, what homage they commanded even from royal personages, a Buddhist's partiality towards the Brahmanical religion becomes still more inexplicable. We may admit that these points by themselves do not form any firm ground for the belief that our author was a Hindu, but we have also to admit that the arguments advanced for making him a Buddhist are even more flimsy and consequently less tenable. It is still an open question and will continue to be, until some evidence of definite and undisputed character is forthcoming. In the mean-time we may assure ourselves on the strength of the data within our knowledge that there is more probability in भामह's being considered a Hindu than a Buddhist.

---

1. काव्यालङ्कार, IV. 39 etc.
2. Ibid III. 13.

THE DATE OF भामह

The most important problem in connection with भामह is his date. It has been the cause of a heated controversy among a number of eminent orientalists for a number of years. After such a long and impassionate discussion, one should expect to have a better result, namely, the exact determination of his date. But unfortunately the result has been quite the reverse. Nothing seems to have been achieved which is not even now enshrouded, to some extent, in the mist of doubt. We propose here to state, as clearly as possible, the various arguments which have been put forward from time to time, to settle this vexed question.

भामह, like most of the Sanskrit writers, does not give any clue to his date in his own work. There is no way of extracting evidence—internal or external—from any known source which may determine his date in exact numbers. What we can do is simply to try to find out the two limits to his date as correctly as the data at our disposal can allow.

Even there we do not seem to be on a very firm ground. We can some how or other settle the lower limit of his date from quotations and references of later writers. But when we proceed to determine the upper limit difficulties begin to multiply. It is there that the great scholars have been crossing swords with each other. Let us, however, begin with the consideration of the lower limit to his date.

By referring to the appendix of our text[1] or to the foot-notes in Mr. Trivedi's text[2], it will be found that the earliest writer to quote भामह directly is आनन्दवर्द्धनाचार्य. Then we learn from a number of later आलङ्कारिकs that उद्भट had written a commentary upon the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह[3]. On comparing the contents of उद्भट's independent work काव्यालङ्कारसङ्ग्रह with भामह's काव्यालङ्कार, it will appear that he had not been content with writing a commentary upon the work of भामह, but had freely drawn upon it for his own work[1]. As will be shown later on, he has not only copied भामह's definitions but has verily repeated them verbatim.

---

[1] Published in the Kashi Sanskrit Series, Benares.

[2] Appendix VIII, प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण (B. S. S. XLV.)

[3] "विशेषोक्तिलक्षणे च भामहविवरणे भट्टोद्भटेन एकदेशशब्द एवं

वामन's अलङ्कारसूत्रवृत्ति gives clear indications of his acquaintance with the work of भामह. It will be shown later on in detail how much and how far he was indebted to our author in the composition of his own work. It is quite sufficient to remember at present, that at some places[2] he seems to paraphrase the verses of भामह[3] in the form of sutras, at others[4] he appears to repeat those very

---

व्याख्यातो यथेहास्माभिर्निरूपितः"—प्रतिहारेन्दुराज in his commentary upon उद्भट's काव्यालङ्कारसंग्रह (Banhatti's Edn. p. 14).

"भामहोक्तं 'शब्दश्छन्दोभिधानार्थः' इत्यभिधानस्य शब्दाद्भेदं व्याख्यातुं भट्टोद्भटो बभाषे"—अभिनवगुप्ताचार्य in his ध्वन्यालोकलोचन, p. 10. Also see pp. 39, 207.

"तस्माद्गड्डुलिकाप्रवाहेन गुणालङ्कारभेद इति भामहविवरणे यद् भट्टोद्भटोऽभ्यधात् तन्निरस्तम्"—हेमचन्द्र in his अलङ्कार चूडामणि p. 17. See also p. 110.

"अपि च 'शब्दानाकुलिता चेति तस्य हेतून् प्रचक्षते' इति भामहीये 'वाचामनाकुलत्वेनापि भाविकम्' इति चोद्भटलक्षणे" etc., अलङ्कारसर्वस्व p. 183. (Nirnaya Sagara Edn.)

[1] See Dr. De's History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I. p. 45. and Kane's Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p. XLII.

[2] वामन's काव्यालङ्कारसूत्र, IV. 2. 1.

[3] भामह's काव्यालङ्कार, II. 30.

[4] IV. 2. 20-21.

views which are held by भामह[1]. He has reproduced[3] one śloka which has been cited by भामह in the name of शाखवर्द्धन[3]. At another place[4] he inaccurately quotes a part of भामह's verse[5] and comments upon the use of a word in it. Such a similarity of language, such a correspondence of views, cannot be a matter of accident but must be attributed to the assimilation of the work of an author of established reputation.

It is clear from the above references that भामह flourished before उद्भट and वामन. The date of उद्भट can be fortunately settled with some precision[6]. He is referred to by आनन्दवर्द्धनाचार्य in his ध्वन्यालोक[7] and spoken of as the सभापति of जयापीड by कल्हण. जयापीड़ reigned in Kashmir from 779 to 813 A. C. As this king, on account of his misrule, became unpopular with the Pandits in the latter part of his reign, उद्भट must have lived in his court before 800 A. C. So the period of उद्भट's literary activity may, with some probability, be assigned to the last quarter of the 8th century. His approximate date may therefore be taken as 800 A. C.

---

1. II. 50.
2. IV. 2. 10.
3. II. 46.
4. V. 2. 38
5. II. 27.
6. See N. D. Banhatti's Introduction to his Edn. of उद्भट's अलङ्कारसारसंग्रह, (B. S. S. No. LXXIX, 1925, Poona); See also S. K. De's History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I, p. 75; P. V. Kane's Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p. XLV; Buhler's Kashmir Report, p. 65.
7. "ध्वन्यलङ्कारान्तरप्रतिभायामपि श्लेषव्यपदेशो भवतीति दर्शितं भट्टोद्भटेन"-ध्वन्यालोक (निर्णयसागर Edn.) p. 96.
   "अन्यत्र वाच्यत्वेन प्रसिद्धो यो रूपकादिरलङ्कारः सोऽन्यत्र प्रतीयमान-

The date of वामन,[1] too, may be similarly settled. राजशेखर, who lived about 900 A.C[2]., refers to the school of वामन[3]. This gives us the lower limit of वामन. He must have lived before 900 A. C.

वामन quotes verses from the plays of भवभूति[4]. Now भवभूति lived somewhere between 700 and 750 A. C.[5] वामन is, therefore, later than 750. According to राजतरङ्गिणी[6], a certain वामन was a minister of King जयापीड़ of Kashmir. There is a tradition among the Pandits of Kashmir that the

---

तया बाहुल्येन प्रदर्शितस्तत्रभवद्भिर्भट्टोद्भटादिभिः"—ध्वन्यालोक p. 108.

[1] For details, see Sanskrit Introductions to Bombay and Banglore Editions of वामन's काव्यालङ्कारसूत्रवृत्ति; Dr. Jha's Preliminary note to his translation of वामन's work; Dr. S. K. De's History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I- p. 81ff; P. V. Kane's Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, pp. XLVIII-L

[2] Mr. C. D. Dalal's Introduction to काव्यमीमांसा; Dr. Konow's Introduction to कर्पूरमञ्जरी (H. O. S.)

[3] "कवयोऽपि भवन्तीति वामनीयाः"—काव्यमीमांसा of राजशेखर (G O. S., No. 1., p. 14.)

" आग्रहपरिग्राहदपि पदस्थैर्यपर्यवसायस्तस्मात् पदानां परिवृत्तिवैमुख्यं पाकः' इतिवामनीयाः"—Ibid, p. 20.

[4] इयं गेहे लक्ष्मीरियममृतवर्तिर्नयनयोः etc.—उत्तररामचरित cited by वामन under IV. 3. 6.

पिङ्गालीपक्ष्मलिन्नः etc. मालतीमाधव cited by वामन under V. 2. 18.

[5] See R. G. Bhandarkar's preface to his edn. of मालतीमाधव (B. S. S. No. XV) p. XIII—XVII, Bombay, 1905; also Smith's paper in J. R. A. S., 1908., p. 793.

[6] " मनोरथः शंखदत्तश्चटकः सन्धिमांस्तथा ।
बभूवुः कवयस्तस्य वामनाद्याश्च मन्त्रिणः" ॥ IV. 497.

author of काव्यालङ्कार सूत्रवृत्ति was identical with this minister. Bühler[1] believes in this tradition and we see no reason to disbelieve it. So, as shown above, उद्भट and वामन are almost synchronous. It is possible that they were rivals of each other. But it is curious that neither of them refers to the other. Howsoever it may be, the date of उद्भट and वामन is approximately about 800 A. C.

शान्तरक्षित qnotes three ślokas[2] from भामह's काव्यालङ्कार[3] which are definetely ascribed to him by the commentator कमलशील. Now शान्तरक्षित lived from 705 to 762 A.C[5]. Thus 700 A. C. may be safely taken to be the lower limit of भामह, though, as we shall show later on, his real lower limit is furnished by बाण.

Now we come to determine the upper limit to the date of भामह. It is here that we have to encounter difficulties of the highest magnitude. Many suggestions have been made, many theories have been propounded. Let us take them one by one and try to see how much water they can hold.

भामह has at one place referred to a न्यासकार. Some scholars were led to think that this point would be of great help in settling a terminus of भामह. A keen and heated controversy ensued and has been raging for a long time. The credit of raising this learned question and then fighting single-handed to maintain his hypothesis with deep scholarship and reasonable plausibility, belongs to the great orientalist, Prof. K. B. Pathak. He found in भामह's mention of

---

1. See Bühler's Kashmir Report, p. 65.
2. तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह, slokas 912—914 (G.O.S. No. XXX)
3. VI. 17—19.
4. तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह p. 291.
5. See Mr. B. Bhattacharya's Foreword (pp. XIII—XVI) to the तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह

न्यासकार a clear reference to जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि, the Buddhist author of काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका, whom he placed, on the evidence of the Chinese traveller, Itsing, in the 7th century. On the basis of this supposition, he tried to prove that भामह must be assigned to the 8th century.[1] He found a very strong opponent in Mr. K. P. Trivedi who proved to the hilt that the structure of Prof. Pathak's hypothesis was raised upon the foundation of sands.[2] Mr. Trivedi, on the merit of his stronger arguments, was supported by almost all the writers on the subject,[3] and was perhaps able at last to convince of his reasonableness even the originator of this controversy.[4]

The verses where न्यासकार is alluded to in the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह, run thus :—

शिष्टप्रयोगमात्रेण न्यासकारमतेन वा ।
तृचा समस्तषष्ठीकं न कथञ्चिदुदाहरेत् ॥
सूत्रज्ञापकमात्रेण वृत्रहन्ता यथोदितः ।
अकेन च न कुर्वीत वृत्तिं तद्गमको यथा ॥

The simple meaning of this extract may be thus expressed—A poet should not make use of a compound, one member of which is formed by adding the suffix तृच् and the

---

1. J. R. A. S. Bom., Vol. xlii ; Ind. Ant., Vol. xli, 1912.
2. Introd. to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण, pp. xxxv ff; Ind. Ant., xlii, 1913.
3. Mr. Kane—Introd. to साहित्यदर्पण, pp. xxxv—xxxvi ;
   Dr. S. K. De–History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I, p. 47; Dr. Jacobi—Sb. der Preuss. Akad. xxiv (1912) pp. 210—211 ;
   Sovani—Pre-Dhvani Schools, Bh. Com. Vol., p. 393.
4. As far as we know, Prof. Pathak has written nothing after 1913 on this subject.

other by the terminations of the genitive case, supporting it by reference to the usage of a learned man or following the view of न्यासकार. One should not make such a use as was done, when the word वृत्रहन्ता was cited by saying that the sutra of Pāṇini becomes ज्ञापक in such a case. Neither should he bring about a compound of words ending with अक with words ending in the genitive case, as, for example, तद्गमक. The sum and substance of भामह's contention is simply this that पाणिनि's sutra तृजकाभ्यां कर्तरि (II. 2. 15) should be strictly followed and no षष्ठीतत्पुरुष compound formed with words ending in the subjective तृच् and अक suffixes. Consequently no compound takes place in cases like अपां स्रष्टा, वज्रस्य भर्ता, ओदनस्य पाचकः etc. Now the passage in जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि's काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका (popularly known as न्यास) which discusses the use of such compounds, runs as follows :—

अथ किमर्थं तृचः सानुबन्धस्योच्चारणम् ? तृनो निवृत्त्यर्थम् । नैतदस्ति तद्योगे न लोकाव्ययेत्यादिना षष्ठीप्रतिषेधात् । एवं तर्हि एतदेव ज्ञापकं भवति तद्योगेऽपि क्वचित् षष्ठी भवतीति । तेन भीष्मः कुरुणां भयशोकहन्तेत्येवमादि सिद्धं भवति ।

This passage is found in connection with the sutra तृजकाभ्यां कर्तरि (II. 2. 15). Here the न्यासकार is discussing the utility of the अनुबन्ध 'च' in तृच् . पाणिनि could have easily said त्रकाभ्याम् rather than तृजकाभ्याम् । Why has he inserted च ? The answer to this question as given by जिनेन्द्र is that it serves to exclude तृन्. But there comes in another difficulty. तृन् cannot be used with words ending in षष्ठी by न लोकाव्ययनिष्ठाखलर्थतृनाम् (II. 3. 69). षष्ठीसमास is out of question. This objection is met by saying that this very sutra becomes ज्ञापक so that the genitive can be used with the words ending in तृच्. The prohibition by लोकाव्ययनिष्ठा

etc. is inconstant. So whenever we meet with a compound of a word ending with a genitive termination and another ending in तृ, we should say that the suffix added is not तृच् but तृन्. Now, on comparison of these two passages with each other it will be evident that भामह insists upon the prohibition of षष्ठीसमास with words ending in तृच् and अक-. As seen in another place[1], he had a very high regard for the authority of पाणिनि. In this particular case also, he wants us to follow the rule of पाणिनि quite literally. He catches this opportunity of referring to the view of a न्यासकार who had allowed (as would appear from the words of भामह) the use of such compounds by saying that this sutra of पाणिनि could very well be taken as a ज्ञापक. It would also appear that the न्यासकार had actually cited the example वृत्रहन्ता and तद्गमक. To ordinary eyes the words of भामह are as clear as anything and they need no torture from out-side, unless, of course, they are meant to yield the desired import already conceived.

Prof. Pathak takes great pains to explain this extract in his own favourite way at one place[2], and elsewhere[3] he gives the sum and substance of his contention. We shall just quote a few sentences from the latter place to show the position assumed by the Professor upon this question. "It will be sufficient" he says, "for my present purpose to point out that in the verses cited above Bhāmaha condemns all genitive compounds like वृत्रहन्ता and तद्गमक as ungrammatical, and says that such compounds should never be employed by young authors aspiring to eminence. When he contrasts the शिष्टप्रयोगमात्र with the न्यासकारमत, he does not mean to say that this particular compound वृत्रहन्ता is used by the शिष्ट or justified by the Nyāsakāra. Bhāmaha mentions this word वृत्रहन्ता as an illustration of the class of genitive compounds justified by the Nyāsakāra. This is amply proved by the expression इत्येवमादि in the sentence भीष्मः कुरूणां भयशोकहन्तेत्येवमादि and by the ज्ञापक discriminating between तृच् and तृन् which applies to all genitive compounds like वृत्रहन्ता । "

---

[1] श्रद्धेयं जगति मतं हि पाणिनीयम्--काव्यालङ्कार VI.63.

[2] J. R. A. S. Bomb., Vol. XXIII., p. 138.

[3] Ind. Ant. XLI, 1912, p. 234.

Thus Prof. Pathak would have us believe that, in spite of the difference existing between the two, भामह and जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि mean the same thing. As shown above भामह and न्यासकार had supported the use of तृच् compound by the help of पाणिनि's ज्ञापकसूत्र । He had perhaps nothing to say about तृन् at that place. But जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि speaks of तृन्, so that wherever we meet with such compounds, he would call the termination तृन् and not तृच् ।

Let us put the whole thing more clearly. पाणिनि has laid down that compounds of words ending in the genitive terminations with words ending in the subjective तृच् and अक affixes, should never be formed. But difficulty arose when the use of such compounds was met with in the writings of classical writers. Now the grammarians were bound to support such uses some how or other. It became especially more binding on them to support such uses for the reason that even in the sutras of पाणिनि such as जनिकर्तुः प्रकृतिः, such compounds are to be found. The important views on the point can be thus stated :—

(i) Some say that, as पाणिनि himself has made use of such compounds in the sutras जनिकर्तुः प्रकृतिः, तत्प्रयोजको हेतुश्च, the निषेध implied by the sutra तृजकाभ्यां कर्तरि, is not absolutely binding: in certain cases such compounds may be allowed.

(ii) जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि, the famous author of the काशिकान्यास, would like to say that the termination here is तृन् and not तृच् and that the prohibition of षष्ठी in the case of तृन् by the rule न लोकाव्यय etc. is अनित्य.

(iii) कैयट and others hold that in such cases we should explain the 6th case-ending as an instance of शेषे षष्ठी. भट्टोजिदीक्षित, who raised this question in his सिद्धान्तकौमुदी[1] and summed up all the views in his प्रौढमनोरमा,[2] seems to favour the view of कैयट ;

(iv) There may be some who having too much regard for grammatical purity, would not permit such uses in any way.

It goes without saying that भामह would be very greatly inclined—as he surely is in his काव्यालङ्कार— to hold the last view. It is known to all who have any knowledge of Sanskrit Poetics that grammatical purity is not identical with rhetorical purity. An expression may be grammatically justified, but it need not, on that account, be consistent with the canons or dicta of good poetry. In poetry expression is as important as the matter it represents. If an expression is doubtful in point of its structural purity, it will not commend itself to a good poet even though the doubt may be the slightest one. This was indeed the position of भामह. From the way in which he refers to the view of a certain न्यासकार,

---

[1] कथं तर्हि "घटानां निर्मातुस्त्रिभुवनविधातुश्च कलहः" इति । शेषषष्ठ्या समास इति कैयटः ।

[2] शेष षष्ठ्या इति । केचित्तु जनिकर्तुः प्रकृतिस्तत्प्रयोजको हेतुश्चेति-निर्देशादनित्योयं निषेध इत्याहुः । न्यासकारस्त्वाह । तृन्नन्तमेतत् । न लोकेति षष्ठीनिषेधस्त्वनित्यः । तृन्भ्यामिति वक्तव्ये तृचः सानुबन्धकस्य ग्रहणाज् ज्ञापकादिति ।

it would appear that even in his days such grammatical speculations were quite brisk, and the point in question has also attracted the attention of scholars. Perhaps the most important view on this point was that which finds its criticism in the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह, viz., that पाणिनि's sutras were taken as ज्ञापक and the निषेध prescribed by the rule तृजकाभ्यां etc. was considered अनित्य.

Let us now compare the view criticised by भामह with the four views stated above and try to find if it corresponds with any of them. It will be seen at once that it coincides with the first one. It will also appear that the first view is distinctly different from the second one which is held by जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि.

Let us now turn towards the examples. The example found in भामह's काव्यालङ्कार is वृत्रहन्ता but in जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि's न्यास it is भीष्मः कुरूणां भयशोकहन्ता. They do not correspond. Prof. Pathak tells us that "Bhāmaha has mentioned this word वृत्रहन्ता as an illustration of the class of genitive compounds justified by the Nyāsakāra." It is indeed inconceivable why भामह should bring in another set of examples and not use the same which were used by जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि, especially when he was so opposed to his view as to refer to him so very pointedly. It is a common practice among good writers that when they have to discuss or even simply refer to such things, they always cite those very examples which were given by their predecessors. शरणदेव [1], for instance, when giving the substance of the passage quoted above, refers to the example of जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि. भट्टोजिदीक्षित[1] undoubtedly begins this discussion with a quite different sentence but his position was not the same as that of जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि or of शरणदेव. He is neither criticising nor summarising the statement of the न्यासकार. He selects the sentence from a very popular श्लोक[2] which, the tradition says, was composed by भवभूति while holding a verbal fight with an opponent. This context perhaps becomes a commentary upon the happy selection of an example on the part of the learned author of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी।

---

[1] कथ भीष्मः कुरूणां भयशोकहन्तेत्युच्यते । तृन्नन्तमेतत् । न च लोकाव्ययनिष्ठेति (II. 3. 69) षष्ठीनिषेधः । यतस्त्रिजकाभ्यमित्यत्र तृचः सानुबन्धकस्योपादानं तृनो निवृत्त्यर्थं ज्ञापयति तृनो योगे क्वचित् षष्ठीति न्यासः ।

A scholar has to be particularly careful about his language when he is engaged in a discussion with another scholar. The same is the case with जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि who draws his example from the popular work, the महाभारत. But the position of भामह was totally different. In criticising the न्यासकार he must necessarily quote the same example, and this is what he actually did. The word उदितः, in the sentence सूत्रज्ञापकमात्रेण वृत्रहन्ता यथोदितः, clearly proves it. He would have never used the word उदितः if he had selected the example at random.

When Prof. Pathak speaks of जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि as the only न्यासकार, 'he tells us something less than the truth.' In spite of his attempt to prove otherwise, there did exist several न्यास's besides the one attributed to जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि. माधवाचार्य, as ponited out correctly by Mr. Trivedi,[3] mentions in his धातुवृत्ति the names of क्षेमेन्द्रन्यास. न्यासोद्योत, बोधिन्यास, शाकटायनन्यास etc. The attempt made by Prof.

---

[1] कथं तर्हि घटानां निर्मातुस्त्रिभुवनविधातुश्च कलह इति etc.

[2] See भोज प्रबन्ध (निर्णयसागर)

[3] Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, 1913, p. 261.

[4] "स्पष्टं चैव गूपधूप इत्यत्र न्यासपदमञ्जर्यादिषु। अत्र क्षेमेन्द्र न्यासे

Pathak to explain them away by saying that 'the word न्यास is frequently used in the sense of grammatical treatise or commentary'[1] does not seem to improve his position in any way. बाण in his हर्षचरित, as first pointed out by Mr. Kane[2], refers to a न्यास. The expression used there is कृतगुरुपदन्यासाः which is explained by the commentator शङ्कर as कृतोऽभ्यस्तो गुरुपदे दुर्बोधशब्दे न्यासो वृत्तिवि (वि) वरणं यैः[3]. None has so far tried to prove that जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि lived before the reign of हर्षवर्द्धन. Mr. R. Narsimhachar[4] writes about a न्यास written by पूज्यपाद, who, according to Mr. Rice, lived about 500 A. C.

Even if it were possible (but in fact it is not) to show that the न्यासकार referred to by भामह, may be जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि, it is not easy to prove that भामह came after जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि। The only ground on which Prof. Pathak placed him about 700 A C., is a string of confused statements of the Chinese traveller, Itsing, about the grammarians of those times. All

---

पणतेः सार्वधातुकेऽप्यायविकल्प उक्तः-धातुवृत्ति (Mysore Edn.) Vol. I., p. 266.

"अंकथितं च इत्यत्र न्यासे निवहि हरि जिदण्डीन् प्रस्तुत्य...... ... न्यासोद्योतेच अजादीनां ग्रामादीनां चेप्सिततमत्वमविशिष्टमित्युक्तम् ibid Vol. I., Pt. II., p. 529.

वोधिन्यासेऽपि सातिः सुखे वर्तते सौत्र इति । जिनेन्द्रहरदत्तौ सातिर्हेतुमण्ण्यन्तः इति-ibid Vol. 5. Pt. I. p. 122.

शाकटायनन्यासकृताऽप्ययमेव पक्षोऽभिमतः—ibid Vol. I. Pt. I. p. 94.

It is to be noted here that in all these quotations जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि is distinctly referred to.

1. Ind. Ant., Vol. XLI, 1912, p. 233.
2. J. R. A. S., Bomb 1909, p. 94.
3. हर्षचरित (Führer's Edn.) p. 133.
4. Ind. Ant. XLI, 1912, p. 91.

these statements cannot be accepted as perfectly correct. Dr. Jacobi[1] has therefore rightly called in question the date assigned by Prof. Pathak to जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि. Keilhorn[2], while noticing a fragment from जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि's work in Poona, wrote: "My impression certainly was that Jinendrabuddhi has freely copied from Haradatta's Padamañjari." Dr. Jacobi[3] has shown, on the authority of भविष्योत्तरपुराण, that हरदत्त died in 878 A.C. This will take जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि to the 10th century at least. We have already shown[4] that भामह cannot be later than 700 A.C. It is impossible for जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि to have copied from the पदमञ्जरी of हरदत्त and still be a predecessor of भामह.

We may now sum up this part of our discussion. The न्यासकार referred to by भामह is not जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि as was supposed by Prof. Pathak. He was an old writer whose work has now become extinct and who is wholly unknown to us. His view, as known from भामह, seems to be referred to by भट्टोजिद्दिक्षित in his प्रौढमनोरमा। So an attempt to find out the other terminus of भामह, with the help of his reference to न्यासकार, cannot go very far and we must look up to something else for it.

भामह and माघ

While dealing with one of the main contributions of Prof. Pathak to the determination of भामह's date, we may, in passing, just note another interesting point raised by the learned professor[5]. This refers to an unconvincing attempt

---

1. Sitzungsberichte der Preusssischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, XXIV, p. 210
2. J.R.A.S. 1908, p 499
3. Sitz. d. Preuss, Akad. d. Wiss., xxis, p. 211
4. p. 16. above
5. J. R.A.S., Bomb. Vol. XXIII, p. 31.

made by him to find out some chronological relation between भामह and माघ. भामह, at one place,[1] expresses his view about the constitution of काव्य and says शब्दार्थौ सहितौ काव्यम्—a view which has attracted the attention of almost all later आलङ्कारिक's of note. माघ has in शिशुपालवध II. 86. the following beautiful श्लोक—

नालम्बते दैष्टिकतां, न निषीदति पौरुषे ।
शब्दार्थौ सत्कविरिव द्वयं विद्वानपेक्षते ॥

Now it is argued that माघ must have been acquainted with भामह's काव्यालङ्कार before he expressed himself in such a strain. This point is maintioned here, not for its importance but for its interest. We need not, therefore, go into detail over this question. Those who feel interested may read the refutation of this argument in the paper of Mr. Kane[2]. We shall only quote a few lines from Dr. J. Nobel's book[3] and leave the rest to the imagination of curious readers. "Māgha is said," writes Dr. J. Nobel, "to refer to the definition of Kāvya as given by Bhāmaha, but if this is considered as an argument I may be allowed to take as an argument of the same force that Kalidāsa in Raghuvaṇśa I.1., by the words *Vāgarthāviva sampṛktau* refers to the very same definition of Bhāmaha, and that by this fact Bhāmaha's priority may be taken for granted. By using the simile of Śabdārtha, however, Māgha probably refers to that of Kālidāsa or perhaps to some other view and not the definition of Kāvya in Bhāmaha. This argument however, is of no great value, because the so-called definition of Kāvya (as consisting of word and sense united) may go back to some older Ālaṃkārikas"

---

[1] काव्यालङ्कार, I. 16.

[2] J. R.A.S. Bomb. Vol. XXIII, p. 91. ff.

[3] The foundations of Indian Poetry, p. 15—16.

भामह and कालिदास

Still more interesting and equally important is the view which seeks to establish the priority of कालिदास to our author. In भामह's काव्यालङ्कार I. 42-44 we read—

> अयुक्तिमद् यथा दूता जलभृन्मारुतेन्दवः ।
> तथा भ्रमरहारीतचक्रवाकशुकादयः ॥
> अवाचो व्यक्तवाचश्च दूरदेशविचारिणः ।
> कथं दूत्यं प्रपद्येरन्निति युक्त्या न युज्यते ॥
> यदि चोत्कण्ठया यत्तदुन्मत्त इव भाषते ।
> तथा भवतु भूम्नेदं सुमेधोभिः प्रयुज्यते ॥

भामह is criticising here those poets who make in their works the cloud, the wind, the moon and similarly some birds to appear as messengers. He calls this an instance of अयुक्तिमद्दोष. It goes wholly against reason, he says, that such creatures should be able to perform the duties of messengers. But he concedes this in the case of those intelligent posts, who, when making use of such devices, show them to be employed by men who are out of their wits.

Now some scholars[1] argue that भामह must have had in mind the मेघदूत of कालिदास where a cloud has been used as a messenger. It is also pointed out that a passage[1] of भामह seems to borrow an idea and phraseology from two

---

[1]. Haricand.—L'Art Poetique de L'Inde, p. 77 ;
V. V. Sovani—Pre-dhawani Schools, Bhandarkar commomoration Volume, p. 393 ;
S. K. De.—History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I. 48.

[2] अस्मिन् जहीहि सुहृदि प्रणयाभ्यसूयामाश्लिष्यगाढममुमानतमादरेण ।
विन्ध्यं महानिव घनः समयेऽभिवर्षन्नानन्दजैर्नयनवारिभिरुक्षतु त्वाम् ॥
I. 56.

श्लोकs[1] of कालिदास. This shows that कालिदास must have flourished before भामह.

Others, on the other hand, hold quite an opposite view. " Bhāmahāchārya, " writes Dr. T. Ganpati Sāstri[2], "it seems to me, must have lived long prior to Kālidāsa. For while he mentions such names of poets and poems as Medhāvī, Rāma Śarmā, Aśmakavamśa, Ratnaharaṇa, Achyutottara, all unknown to us, he has never mentioned the name of Kālidāsa of world-wide fame or any of his works of supreme excellence. But had Bhāmaha ever seen the poems of Kālidāsa he would have of course mentioned them or made them also as in the case of Pratijñānātikā subject of his criticism." After this the learned Pandit quotes those three verses of भामह[3] which we have given above and remarks—"From this we cannot conclude that भामह was conversant with the poem Meghadūta, for then we could as well infer that he knew also of Śukasandeśa written by a poet of yesterday. Hence, I think, that by these ślôkas, our Áchārya only teaches us generally that the fashion in some of our Kāvyas of lovers sending messages through such inanimate objects as the wind, the moon, the clouds and such living inarticulate creatures as the bee, the chakravaka and the parrot is not desirable on occasions when the sender of the message is in a state of sobriety. Bearing in mind this instruction of our

---

[1] अथाभिषेकं रघुवंशकेतोः प्रारब्धमानन्दजलैर्जनन्योः ।
निर्वर्तयामासुरमात्यवृद्धास्तीर्थाहृतैः काञ्चनकुम्भतोयैः ॥
सरित्समुद्रान् सरसीश्च गत्वा रक्षःकपीन्द्रैरुपपादितानि ।
तस्यापतन् मूर्ध्नि जलानि जिष्णोर्विन्ध्यस्य मेघप्रभवा इवापः ॥
—रघुवंश XIV. 7-8

[2] Introduction to स्वप्नवासवदत्ता and प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायण (Trivendrum Edn.)

[3] काव्यालङ्कार, I. 42-44.

Āchārya, Kālidāsa, with his keen sense of poetic propriety, observes, in defence of his message through the cloud at the begining of Meghadūta :—

धूमज्योतिःसलिलमरुतां सन्निपातः क्व मेघः
सन्देशार्थाः क्व पटुकरणैः प्राणिभिः प्रापणीयाः ।
इत्यौत्सुक्यादपरिगणयन् गुह्यकस्तं ययाचे
कामार्ता हि प्रकृतिकृपणाश्चेतनाचेतनेषु॥—पूर्वमेघ ।

Thus it is seen that Bhāmaha lived much prior to Kalidāsa."

This long quotation from the most important exponent of this side of the view, will make the position quite clear. It may be interesting to know that Dr. Nobel also was formerly a believer in the priority of भामह to कालिदास. Even now, with his belief slightly shaken, (simply because he could not directly prove it) he is more inclined to accept the priority of भामह to कालिदास than that of कालिदास to भामह.[1]

Taking the arguments from both sides into consideration, we may confess that much can be said on both sides and that nothing is really settled. One cannot imagine that such a criticism can be possible without any work to be criticised and explain on the other hand, why other things connected with कालिदास should not have come under the notice of भामह, if the works of the great poet were known to him.

Whatsoever may be the fact, it is needless to carry this discussion to any further length, because, even if it were decided one way or the other, it will not in any way help us in determining the date of भामह. The date of कालिदास itself is a bone of contention and cannot be made a basis for determination of other dates.

---

[1] See Nobel's The Foundations of Indian Poetry, pp. 14-15.

भामह AND भास.

The same remark is to be made with regard to the chronological relation of भामह and भास, though in this case, it has not been suggested by any person that भामह came after the author of the work he is criticising. The difficulty with us here is that we cannot exactly know what work he is criticising. The verses in the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह which refer to the criticism in question read thus—

विजिगीषुमुपन्यस्य वत्सेशं वृद्धदर्शनम् ।
तस्यैव कृतिनः पश्चादभ्यधाच्चरशून्यताम् ॥
अन्तर्योधशताकीर्णं सालङ्कायननेतृकम् ।
तथाविधं गजच्छद्म नाज्ञासीत् स स्वभूगतम् ॥
यदि वोपेक्षितं तस्य सचिवैः स्वार्थसिद्धये ।
अहो नु मन्दिमा तेषां भक्तिर्वा नास्ति भर्तरि ॥
शरा दृढधनुर्मुक्ता मन्युमद्भिररातिभिः ।
मर्माणि परिहृत्यास्य पतिष्यन्तीति कानुमा ॥
हतोऽनेन ममभ्राता मम पुत्रः पिता मम ।
मातुलो भागिनेयश्च रुषा संरब्धचेतसः ॥
अस्यन्तो विविधान्याजावायुधान्यपराधिनम् ।
एकाकिनमरण्यानां न हन्युर्बहवः कथम् ॥
नमोऽस्तु तेभ्यो विद्वद्भ्यो येऽभिप्रायं कवेरिमम् ।
शास्त्रलोकावपास्यैव नयन्ति नयवेदिनः ॥
सचेतसो वनेभस्य चर्मणा निर्मितस्य च ।
विशेषं वेद बालोऽपि कष्टं किन्तु कथं नु तत् ॥ IV.39-46

The stories of उदयन, the king of वत्सs, were very popular in ancient India, so much so that many works, even besides those which directly devote themselves to them, refer to them here and there. So when we find such a criticism in the work of भामह, we cannot exactly determine what is the actual object of his criticism. Dr. T. Ganapati Śāstri suggests that the work criticised must be प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायण. "The subject reviewed by Bhāmaha above," says the eminent editor, "is seen in its entirety in Pratijñānāṭikā. Moreover, the Prakrit passage "अणेण मम भादा हदो, अणेण मम पिदा, अणेण मम सुदो" in the first Act of Pratijñānāṭikā is quoted in the form of verse, "हतोऽनेन मम भ्राता मम पुत्रः पिता मम" by Bhāmaha, in his enquiry on Nyāyavirodha."

In spite of this suggestion made by the learned Pandit, we may observe that the case is much doubtful. भामह does not mention the name of भास or his प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायण. He may be criticising गुणाढ्य's बृहत्कथा itself which was indeed the oldest compendium of such stories. The Prakrit portion common with भामह's श्लोक, might have a similar representative passage there also. Moreover, the theory of the learned Śāstri itself, as observes Mr. Kane, is based on a very weak foundation. If we examine the passage from भामह more closely, it will be found that the story criticised by him is not exactly the same as found in प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायण. It corresponds more with the versions found in बृहत्-कथा मञ्जरी and कथा-सरित्-सागर. They are known to be the epitomes of बृहत्कथा. But even if it was proved that it is भास who has been criticised, it will not help us in any way. For the last 14 years, a sharp controversy has been going on, not only with regard to the date of भास, but also concerning the authenticity of the works published in his name. As there is no certainty about the date of भास, there is no use putting it forward as a terminus of भामह.

भामह AND भट्टि।

It will not be perhaps out of place to devote some space here for discussing the relation of भट्टि and भामह. It is a well-known tradition among the Pandits of India that भट्टि, the famous author of the grammatical Kāvya, known as रावणवध or simply as भट्टिकाव्य, tried to furnish illustrations to the काव्यालङ्कार in the four cantos (X—XIII) known as प्रसन्नकाण्ड exactly as he did in others for the sutras of Pāṇini. This tradition finds further support from the statements of the commentators[1]. It would appear from the way they write that भट्टि wrote the 10th canto to illustrate figures of word and sense, 11th, माधुर्यगुण, 12th, भाविक and the 13th Sanskrit and Prakrit Kāvya. प्रसादगुण finds its illustration in all the four cantos. If we look at the श्लोकs illustrating अलङ्कारs in canto X, we shall find, from the order and the way they are given, that भट्टि had भामह's काव्यालङ्कार before him. The commentators जयमङ्गल and मल्लिनाथ have freely drawn upon the work of भामह for giving the definitions of these अलङ्कारs in their commentaries.[2] They could have easily taken the definitions from later and fuller rhetorcial works. But then the illustrative श्लोकs would not have so well conformed to those definitions. There is a श्लोक in भामह's काव्यालङ्कार which is found in भट्टिकाव्य with very slight alterations. The श्लोक of भामह is—

काव्यान्यपि यदीमानि व्याख्यागम्यानि शास्त्रवत् ।
उत्सवः सुधियामेव हन्त दुर्मेधसो हताः ॥ —II. 20

In भट्टिकाव्य we have

---

[1] शब्दलक्षणमुक्तमपि लक्षयन् काव्यलक्षणार्थं प्रसन्नकाण्डमुच्यते, काव्यस्यात्र प्रसन्नत्वात् । प्रथमं चेदं लक्षणं यत्प्रसन्नता नाम आविद्वदङ्गनाबालप्रतीतार्थं प्रसन्नवदिति ।.................तथास्मिन् काण्डे चत्वारः परिच्छेदाः । अलङ्कार माधुर्यप्रदर्शनदोषाः भाषासमावेशश्चेति etc.—जयमङ्गल in his commentary in the beginning of canto X.

शब्दलक्षणप्रधानेऽप्यास्मिन् काव्ये काव्यलक्षणत्वादधिकारकण्डानन्तरमलङ्कार माधुर्यं भाविक भाषासमाख्य परिच्छेदचतुष्टयात्मककमारभमानोऽस्मिन् सर्गे तावदलङ्कारपरिच्छेदं वदन्नादौ शब्दालङ्कारान् लेशतो दर्शयति । —मल्लिनाथ in his commentary on भट्टिकाव्य in the beginning of canto X.

[2] See परिशिष्ट to our edn. of भामह's काव्यालङ्कार. जयमङ्गल has no less than 33 quotations from this work.

व्याख्यागम्यमिदं काव्यमुत्सवः सुधियामलम् ।
हता दुर्मेधसश्चास्मिन् विद्वत्प्रियतया मया ॥—XXII.34.

Here it can be imagined quite easily that one of the two must have borrowed from the other. श्रीवत्साङ्कमिश्र ascribes the former श्लोक to भामह. There on this authority it necessarily follows that भट्टि must have imitated भामह in writing his श्लोक.[1] All these facts, stated above, cannot but point to one conclusion, in that भामह was prior to भट्टि.

Now as regards the date of भट्टि, the only clue which we have is his श्लोक forming the last verse of his काव्य. It is—

काव्यमिदं विहितं मया बलभ्यां
श्रीधरसेननरेन्द्रपालितायाम् ।
कीर्तिरतो भवतान्नृपस्य तस्य
क्षेमकरः क्षितिपो यतः प्रजानाम् ॥—XXII. 35.

The history of Kathiawar tells us that there were four Kings with the name of धरसेन who ruled over बलभी (modern Vala). It is not quite clear which धरसेन is alluded to by भट्टि[2].

Prof. B. C. Mazumdar[3] identifies the author of भट्टिकाव्य with वत्सभट्टि, mentioned in the Mandasor Sun Temple Inscription,[4] dated 473 A.C. on the ground of similarty between the verses of the inscription and the description of autumn in the भट्टिकाव्य.[5] But this identification is considered by Prof. Keith as a 'most unfortunate suggestion'[6].

---

1. Trivedi—Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, p. 264.
2. For more information, see Mr. Trivedi's introduction to भट्टिकाव्य (B. S. S. No LVI.)
3. J. R. A, S., 1904, pp. 395-397.
4. Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, No. 18.
5. Canto II.
6. J. R. A. S., 1909, p. 759.

But the two learned professors are at one in saying that भट्टि flourished before भारवि and दण्डी. We may go so for as to say, with Mr. Trivedi[1] that "our poet lived in the latter part of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century." But the safest course will be to side with Mr. Kane[2] and say that "भट्टि must have lived sometime between 500 and 650 A.C."[3] Whatever might have been the difference with regard to the date of भट्टि, none was heard to suggest till 1922 that भट्टि was prior to भामह. In this year Dr. Jacobi[4] struck a new line of argument in determining the date of भामह. He tried to prove with all plausibility that भामह had drawn his material for the 5th chapter of काव्यालङ्कार from the न्यायबिन्दु of धर्मकीर्ति. This necessitated the placing of भामह after 650 A. C. Now भट्टि, as shown above, cannot be later than 650. So the learned scholars were compelled to look upon the relation of भट्टि to भामह from quite a different angle of vision. Dr. S. K. De, who, as far as we remember, never disagrees with Dr. Jacobi but always follows in his foot-steps, writes[5]—"At one time it was believed, on the indication given by Jayamangala on Bhatti that the alamkāra-chapters in that काव्य especially canto X, was meant to illustrate the rhetorical teachings of Bhāmaha in particular, but the date now assigned to Bhāmaha (i. e. after धर्मकीर्ति's date 650) will re-adjust his relation to Bhatti in a new light." The two learned doctors have taken great pains in 're-adjusting' भामह's relation to भट्टि. Re-adjustnent has been in the present case nothing less than perfect reversion of the former position. There is no use of examining on our part this 're-adjustment' in all its details, for it has not been so much a child of logic as one of necessity. The present case appears to us like that of a certain talented lawyer. He once began to put forward arguments which might have been advanced by the other side. When he was on the point of completing his arguments, he was made aware of his blunder by one of his colleagues. He remained unmoved and at once addressed the court. "My Lords, such will be the arguments put forward by the other side. Now I begin to refute them." We wonder why the premises of the conclusion which upset the whole thing, were not more carefully examined to see if there was some other alternative possible. Such cases of resemblance, corroboroted by the record of commentators and confirmed by the voice of tradition, as exist between the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह and the रावणवध of भट्टि, cannot be a matter of mere chance. As we shall try to show later on, भामह cannot be carried below 600 A.C. He may be much earlier. So there is no necessity of putting the cart before the horse.

---

[1] Introduction to his Edn. of भट्टिकाव्य (B. S. S. No. LVI), P. XXII.

[2] Introduction to his Edn. of साहित्यदर्पण, P. XVI.

[3] For the discussions on the date of भट्टि, see also Dr. Jacobi-Z. D. M. G., XLIV and also Sitz. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 1922, pp. 216-17; V. V. Sovani—Bhandarkar commomoration Volume, p. 393; S. K. De—History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I. p. 50ff.

[4] Sitz. d. Preuss Akad. d. Wiss., No. XXIV, pp-211-12.

[5] History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I p. 50.

दण्डी and भामह.

Now we come to one of the most important parts of the discussion upon the date of भामह. दण्डी, the auther of काव्यादर्श, has been very popular among the literati of mediæval India, perhaps even to some extent more than भामह himself, who had the misfortune of having his work not so easily available. On a close study of the works of these great poeticians, the impression becomes irresistible that they were related to each other, some way or other. There are some passages which are identical in the works of both, not only in sense but even in phraseology[1]. There are others, more important still, which appear to involve mutual criticism.[2] Besides, there are various views—either similar or dissimilar to one another—which clearly point to an intimate relation existing between the काव्यालङ्कार and काव्यादर्श[3] ।

These impressions, culled from the works of these two writers, led to the discussion of their chronological relation with each other. A sharp controversy ensued for settling the priority of one to the other. Mr. M. T. Narsimheingar raised this issue for the first time and was inclined to place दण्डी before भामह[4] He found his arguments very ably refuted by such eminent scholars as Mr. Trivedi[5], Dr. Jacobi[6], Prof. Rangacharya[7], Dr. Ganpati Śastri[8] and Prof. Pathak[9]. The last seems, however, to have changed his view later on[10]. As the majority of views appears to favour the priority of भामह, we need not encumber our humble paper with the statements of all views held either against or in favour of his priority. Mr. Kane has very cautiously collected the arguments of either side and those who feel interested may refer to his learned work[1]. Mr. Kane, after stating and examining all such views with admiriable impartiality, has come to the conclusion that in reality no judgement is yet possible on the question one way or the other though from the character of the arguments employed he seems to be somewhat inclined in favour of दण्डी's priority to भामह. He sums up his position thus : " It seems probable that भामह and दण्डी follow independent traditions, the former having more affinity with the अलङ्कार school and the latter with भरत's school. Whoever may be earlier, both are very near each other and are to be placed between 500-630 A. C.[2]" Dr. De has, however, by forcibly re-stating some cogent arguments, ably demonstrated that the majority view is the only best logical alternative[3].

---

[1] Kane—Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p. XXV ; De—History of Sanskrit Poetics, I. pp. 64-65.

[2] De—History of Sanskrit Poetics, I. pp. 65-66.

[3] Kane—Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, pp. XXV—XXXV.

[4] J. R. A. S., 1905, pp. 535 ff.

[5] Introduction to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण pp. XXIII ff. ; Ind. Ant. XLII, ff. ; Bhandarkar Com. Vol., p. 40.

[6] Z. D. M. G., LXIV, pp. 134 and 139.

[7] Introduction to his edition of काव्यादर्श.

[8] Introduction to स्वप्नवासवदत्त, p. XXV.

[9] Introduction to कविराजमार्ग, p. 16.

[10] J.B.B.R.A.S , XXIII. p. 19; Ind. Ant. XLI., p. 236 ff.

We shall, by way of concluding this portion of our paper, state one or two points which, to our mind, would conclusively show that भामह cannot be brought down to a period later than दण्डी. Recently a book named अवन्तिसुन्दरीकथा has been discovered in the South by the Curator of the Madras Oriental MSS. Library[4]. It is evident from the said MS. that it was written by दण्डी. It is prefaced, as is usually done in कथाs, with a number of verses. These verses include the praise of बाण and मयूर[5] along with that

---

1. Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, pp. XXV—XXXV.
2. Ibid p. XXXV.
3. History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I, pp. 64—70.
4. Proceedings and Transactions of the Second Oriental Conference, pp. 193–201; Journal of the Mythic Society, XIII, pp. 671–685.
5. भिन्नस्तीक्ष्णमुखेनापि चित्रं बाणेन निर्व्यथः ।
   व्याहारेषु जहौ लीलां न मयूरः………… ॥

of many others. From this Poetic Introduction, we further learn that दण्डी was a great-grandson of भारवि who has been described here as a contemporary of kings दुर्विनीत and सिंहविष्णु. These monarchs were great ruling kings about 580 A.C. Thus it appears quite reasonable to infer that दण्डी, being fourth in descent from भारवि, must have belonged to the last quarter of the 7th or the begining of the 8th Century. This statement finds an additional support from the fact that दण्डी has not only praised बाणभट्ट but has narrated the story of कादम्बरी along with other episodes in his कथा and this narration seems to be an accurate reproduction of the tale as is found in the पूर्वार्द्ध of बाण's कादम्बरी. It is a well known fact that बाण belonged to the court of हर्षवर्धन who reigned from 606 to 648 A.C. A northern poet cannot be expected to have achieved in a decade or two, in those days of hard communication, so much fame as to merit such a high praise from a critic of the South.

It may be further shown on a most reliable authority that भामह must have lived before बाण. आनन्दवर्धन in hsi ध्वन्यालोक,[1] while asserting that the same idea, though already expressed by one poet, appears new and charming when put in a suggestive garb by another poet, points out a case where बाणभट्ट, drawing upon an idea expressed by भामह in one of his verses of काव्यालङ्कार, writes a prose passage in हर्षचरित. It is quite clear from this that आनन्दवर्धन had positive belief which must have been based on traditions prevalent among the Kāśmirian Pandits of his day that भामह was an old and popular predecessor of बाण so that the latter could safely and honourably borrow ideas from the former. Hence unless this statement of आनन्दवर्धन is shown to militate against the verdict of accepted chronology bearing on the question (as is quite unlikely) the fact of भामह's priority can never be challenged.

---

[1] तथा विवक्षितान्यपरवाच्यस्यैव शब्दशक्त्युद्भवानुरणनरूपव्यङ्ग्यप्रकार-समाश्रयेण नवत्वम् । यथा 'धरणीधारणायाधुना त्वं शेषः' (हर्षचरित VI. para 15 of Kane's edition) इत्यादौ 'शेषो हिमगिरिस्त्वं च महान्तो गुरवः स्थिराः । यदलङ्घितमर्यादाश्चलन्तीं बिभ्रते भुवम्' (काव्यालङ्कार III 27.) इत्यादौ सत्स्वपि तस्यैवार्थशक्त्युद्भवानुरणनरूपव्यङ्ग्यसमाश्रयेण नवत्वम् ।—ध्वन्यालोक, उद्योत IV p.236.

With due deference to those who hold that भामह and दण्डी are chronologically very near to and not far removed from each other, we may be permitted to observe here, in passing, that to us it does not appear to be the fact. भामह most probably belonged to Kāśmir and दण्डी undoubtedly hailed from the South. It cannot be imagined that the writers so far removed could vie with each other in those days. It cannot be denied that दण्डी, with an evident criticising mood, tries to eclipse the work of भामह by his own. This case is somewhat like भारवि and माघ who, though not far removed in space, were, in time, far away from each other. This point can be further borne out by the linguistic evidence. The प्राकृतs had not, perhaps, been so much in vogue in the time of भामह as they were in the time of दण्डी. Perhaps सेतुबन्ध which finds such a high and merited eulogy from दण्डी had not yet been written. भामह makes no linguistic division of काव्य as दण्डी does. If it could be proved that the प्राकृतमनोरमा, the oldest commentary on वररुचि's प्राकृतप्रकाश, was from the pen of this very भामह, the author of काव्यालङ्कार, it might be held to have been the oldest work on Prakrit Grammar, next only to वररुचि, the author of the सूत्रs it comments upon. In this connection it may be pointed out that the later महाराष्ट्री—not to say the other dialects—does not wholly conform to the rules of वररुचि as explained by भामह and that the later commentators, वसन्तराज and others, have tried to explain the सूत्रs in a much more comprehensive way. Howsoever it may be, it is undoubtedly clear that the picture of society found in the work of भामह—faintly drawn though it may be—can be clearly distinguished from what we find depicted in the काव्यादर्श of दण्डी. The poetic luminaries so familiar to the eyes of भामह's age had, by the time of दण्डी, totally disappeared from the horizon. The elegant simplicity of the earlier Muse had not as yet hardened into sentimental ideas and artistic expressions. The sharp controversies ranging between the Buddhists and the Hindus in the time of भामह, had led to the study of the science and art of Polemics, so that even a work on Poetics was expected to take the topics into consideration. But the atmosphere seems to have wholly changed by the time of दण्डी. The heroes of popular stories were yet fresh in the memory of the people. Coming to the field of Poetics itself, we find not a few points of contrast along with those of similarity in the works of these two authors. There is no use enlarging upon this topic, for, it can become obvious to even a casual reader of the said works. We feel, therefore, inclined to believe that भामह was seperated from दण्डी not by decades but by centuries.

भामह and धर्मकीर्ति.

We have shown above that on the evidence of आनन्दवर्धन in ध्वन्यालोक, भामह cannot be placed later than बाण who flourished in the first half of the 7th century; but this view is seriously challenged by the hypothesis that भामह has borrowed some logical topics from धर्मकीर्ति. Dr. Jacobi has discussed this point at some length and in that connection has considered the date of धर्मकीर्ति. He places धर्मकीर्ति between the sojourns in India of Houen Tsang and of Itsing. The former who travelled between 630 and 643 makes no reference to the Buddhist Logician. The latter, travelling between 671 to 695, seems clearly to have heard of him. Tāranātha[1] makes धर्मकीर्ति a contemporary of the Tibetan King Sroṅ-tsan-gam-po who lived during 627-698 A. C. So the middle of the seventh century may be fairly taken to be the date of धर्मकीर्ति. If, however, it could be proved, as Jacobi has tried to do, that भामह had actually utilised the logical work of धर्मकीर्ति, the statement of आनन्दवर्धन would considerably lose in value and भामह would consequently have the chance of being dragged down to the 8th century at least. Let us first examine the arguments put forward therefor.

All the arguments put forward for establishing the indebtedness of भामह to धर्मकीर्ति are based upon a few points of similarity existing in their works[2]. They are only three. Let us take them one by one. भामह has given two definitions of अनुमान—

त्रिरूपाल्लिङ्गतो ज्ञानमनुमानं च केचन ।
तद्विदो नान्तरीयार्थदर्शनं चापरे विदुः ॥ काव्या० V. 11

Now we know from the तात्पर्यटीका of वाचस्पतिमिश्र upon न्यायवार्तिक that the definition of अनुमान, as given here in the second half of the śloka, came originally from दिङ्नाग[3]. But what are we to say about the first difinition? "Die erste der beiden von Bhamaha gegeben Definitionen", writes Dr. Jacobi, "mutz also von einem andern Philosophen herrühren". And who is that another philosopher? It is धर्मकीर्ति—says Dr. Jacobi, for, at one place of his न्यायबिन्दु, we read अनुमानं द्विधा स्वार्थं परार्थं च, तत्र स्वार्थं त्रिरूपाल्लिङ्गाद् यदनुमेये ज्ञानं तदनुमानम् ।

---

[1] See Vidyābhūṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, pp. 305-6.

[2] See Dr. Jacobi's 'Bhāmaha und Daṇḍin ihr Alterund ihre Stellung in der indischen Poetic' in Sitz. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., XXIV, 1922, pp. 211-212.

[3] See Dr. Randle's 'Fragments from Diṅnāga,' pp. 21-22.

In this case as well as in the cases following, the question, which we are to put to ourselves, should be whether a particiular view— लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम् for instance—is peculiar with someone or is common to many. Such an argument can have any weight only when the view concerned is original. Unfortunately we do not find any such thing in the present case. लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम् is a too well-known thing with our नैयायिकs to have originated with धर्मकीर्ति. It is quite sufficient for our purpose here to show that it was known even to दिङ्नाग. Thanks to the labours of the late lamented Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa, we can have some knowledge of दिङ्नाग's works. दिङ्नाग in his प्रमाणसमुच्चय spoke of स्वार्थानुमान thus[1]: An inference for one's self (svārthānumāna, raṅ-don-gyi-rjeṣ-ḍpag) is defined as the knowledge of a thing derived through its mark or sign of three characters. Will it not, when turned into Sanskrit, read somewhat exactly like the extract from न्यायबिन्दु of धर्मकीर्ति cited above? In this connection we are to note one thing more. The way in which भामह gives this definition along with that of दिङ्नाग, does not only show that it came from some other source, but also to the fact that it formed an earlier and more commonly accepted view. Besides प्रमाणसमुच्चय, we have a clear description of लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम् in न्यायप्रवेश.[2] Whoever might be the author of this work,[1] none has so far tried to prove that it was written after धर्मकीर्ति. Thus we see that भामह was not in any way indebted to धर्मकीर्ति for his knowledge of लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम्. We are very much inclined to think that he had not to thank even दिङ्नाग for, at least, this section of Indian Logic. He might have probably derived his knowledge from some earlier logician.

---

[1] See Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, p. 280.

[2] This work has been so long known only through Tibetan

The other statement of भामह which has been said to correspond with that of धर्मकीर्ति is दूषणं न्यूनताद्युक्तिः (काव्या०-V. 28). धर्मकीर्ति has दूषणानि न्यूनताद्युक्तिः[2] । The similarity is indeed striking. But the question again comes up: Is it an original idea of धर्मकीर्ति? The same question may be raised with regard to the third corresponding statement of भामह—जातयो दूषणाभासाः (काव्या०-V. 29). Does धर्मकीर्ति propound a new theory when he says दूषणाभासास्तु जातयः[3]? In both the above cases, धर्मकीर्ति does not appear to have anything peculiar to himself. The दूषणs and जातिs have been known to earlier writers

---

Texts. Fortunately it is now going to be published by Principal A. B. Dhruva in the Gaekwad Oriental Series. We owe our knowledge of it to the kindness of Principal Dhruva.

For the three characteristics of the Middle Term (लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम्) as found in न्यायप्रवेश, see History of Indian Logic, p. 291.

[1] The question is a mooted one. We postpone its discussion for the time being.

[2] न्यायबिन्दु, (Peterson's Edn.) III. 138.
Benares Edn. reads दूषणा न्यूनताद्युक्तिः. See p. 132.

[3] न्यायबिन्दु, Peterson's Edn. III. 140; Benares Edn. p. 133.

as well[1]. In न्यायप्रवेश we have similar descriptions of दूषणs and जातिs[2].

Mr. P. V. Kāṇe[3], who, as has been noted before, pointed out the similarity existing between the works of भामह and धर्मकीर्ति, quite independently of Dr. Jacobi, has cited another śloka from भामह's काव्यालङ्कार, appearing somewhat exactly like a passage in धर्मकीर्ति's न्यायविन्दु. भामह's śloka reads thus ;

> सत्त्वादयः प्रमाणाभ्यां प्रत्यक्षमनुमा च ते ।
> असाधारणसामान्यविषयत्वं तयोः किल ॥ काव्या०-V. 5

धर्मकीर्ति writes thus:

द्विविधं सम्यग्ज्ञानं प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं च (p. 10). तस्य विषयः स्वलक्षणं (p. 21)......अन्यत् सामान्यलक्षणं (p. 24) सोऽनुमानस्य विषयः (p. 25). Now it may be again pointed out here that this division and definition of प्रमाणs has not originated with धर्मकीर्ति । Almost all the logicians who were opposed to अक्षपाद (who propounded four प्रमाणs) had mostly a similar view. दिङ्नाग, for instance, in his प्रमाणसमुच्चय (ch. 1) states that pramāṇas are only two, *viz.*, perception and inference. All objects being known through them, there is no other प्रमाण । Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa has restored the Sanskrit original thus :

---

[1] They are too well-known to require much argumentation for establishing their existence before धर्मकीर्ति. In this connection it will be, however, interesting to refer to a न्यायसूत्र of गौतम (1-2-18) and वात्स्यायन's भाष्य thereon. The sutra is साधर्म्यवैधर्म्याभ्यां प्रत्यवस्थानं जातिः । वात्स्यायन comments upon it thus :—प्रयुक्ते हि हेतौ यः प्रसङ्गो जायते सा जातिः । स च प्रसङ्गः साधर्म्यवैधर्म्याभ्यां प्रत्यवस्थानमुपालम्भः प्रतिषेध इति ।…… ……प्रत्यनीकभावाज्जायमानोऽर्थो जातिरिति ।

[2] See Vidyābhuṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, p. 298.

[3] Introduction to his Edn. of साहित्यदर्पण, p. XL.

प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं च प्रमाणं हि द्विलक्षणम् ।
प्रमेयं तत्र सिद्धं हि न प्रमाणान्तरं भवेत् ॥

It will be seen from the above that all those passages from धर्मकीर्ति, which have been cited as originals of भामह's ślokas, have no originality with themselves. They represent views which were quite well-known even before the birth of the Buddhist logician. Under such circumstances one cannot safely argue that भामह was indebted to धर्मकीर्ति and to nobody else. Dr. Jacobi is not such a superficial scholar as to be convinced of भामह's indebtedness to धर्मकीर्ति simply upon the basis of accidental similarity of views. We presume that it was the partial similarity of phraseology too, which led him to entertain such a view. But to our mind, the similariy of phraseology in the present case is not so very significant. Striking similarity is seen only in the sentences which deal with दूषणs and जातिs. But there again, we cannot say that धर्मकीर्ति was the first person to use them. With equal force, we may say that it was भामह who wrote them first of all. We see no absurdity in it. If शान्तरक्षित, philosopher as he was, did not find it inconvenient to repeat the phraseology of our poetician, we see no reason why धर्मकीर्ति would not do the some, if he could find something handy, cut and dried, from him.

What we want to emphasise very particularly is simply this that the similarity of phraseology, even if it could be proved to exist beyond doubt, will not by itself be of much use. In such a case, there are three alternatives possible, each of which being equally tenable. Now with regard to the topic in question, unless and until more definite evidence is forthcoming, none can be justified in claiming that **भामह** borrowed views and phraseology from धर्मकीर्ति. It may be equally cogent to say that धर्मकीर्ति was indebted to भामह or both of them had utilised some common source.

As far as we are aware, Dr. Jacobi did not point out any other line of evidence which could further support his assumption. "Diese Entlehungen Bhāmahas" says the great orientalist, "aus Dharmakīrtis Nyāyabindu beweisen, dass er jünger als dieser, wenn auch vielleicht nur ein jüngerer Zeitgenosse desselben, war". But how has the indebtedness of भामह been proved? There he writes thus: "Nun lautet Dharmakīrtis Definition, Nyāyabindu II. 3: tatra trirūpālliṅgād yad anumeye jñānaṃ, tad anumānaṃ so ähnlich der Bhāmaha von gegebenen, dass kaum noch ein Zweifel darüber bestehen kann, woher letzterer sie genommen hat. Noch deutlicher zeigen uns das Bhāmaha Definitionen der dūṣaṇas und der jātis in V. 28." This is the sum and substance of all his statements in this connection. We really wonder how such a veteran scholar as Dr. Jacobi, with such faulty and inadequate premises, could jump to such a momentous conclusion. Mr. P. V. Kāṇe, with characteristic cautiousness of a lawyer, did not, though suggesting the same line of argument, commit himself in any way. He is perhaps more inclined to suggest भामह's indebtedness to दिङ्नाग, if he could only prove it. It is gratifying to note that Dr. Jacobi's hypothesis is not now meeting with that universal approbation which it was at first expected to do. It has been called in question by Dr. J. Nobel[2] and quietly ignored by Dr. B. Bhaṭṭāchārya[3].

---

1. See his Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p. XL.
2. 'Die Avantisundarīkathā', Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistic, Bd. V, p. 150.
3. Foreword to शान्तरक्षित's तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह (G. O. S. XXX), pp. LXXIX--LXXX.

The best way for determining whether भामह was indebted to धर्मकीर्ति or not, would have been perhaps the comparison of भामह's views with the peculiar views of धर्मकीर्ति. It is known to all who know anything of mediaeval logic that धर्मकीर्ति, though a follower of दिङ्नाग, did not adopt his views *in toto*. The peculiarities of धर्मकीर्ति have been carefully noted by Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa[1] and a reference to these will surely make it clear that no special view of the Buddhist logician has been represented in the work of भामह. On the contrary, there are indications which point diametrically to the opposite side. We may just refer to some of them. The definition of प्रत्यक्ष, as given by दिङ्नाग, is प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढम्[2] । To this an important addition is made by धर्मकीर्ति by saying प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढमभ्रान्तम्[3]. Now the term अभ्रान्तं is not such as can be ignored by any person coming after him. दिङ्नाग's definition was rather too general and consequently could be interpreted to apply to everything, so that everything will be प्रत्यक्ष. उद्योतकर did actually interpret it in this way[4]. To avoid this contingency, धर्मकीर्ति added अभ्रान्तं which made it clear that by प्रत्यक्ष, we were to mean here प्रत्यक्षज्ञानं and nothing else. Who will indulge in such an inexactitude when once it has been so pointed out? भामह gives two definitions of प्रत्यक्ष in a single line. It is—

---

[1] See Vidyābhūṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, pp. 315—318.

[2] वाचस्पतिमिश्र in his तात्पर्यटीका, while commenting upon 'अपरे तु मन्यन्ते प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढमिति,' begins, 'सम्प्रति दिङ्नागस्य लक्षणमुपन्यस्यति अपर इति । See also Vidyābhūṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, pp. 276—277 and Dr. Randle's Fragments from Diṅnāga, pp. 8—10.

[3] See न्यायबिन्दु (Benares Edn.), p. 11.

[4] He takes it as स्वरूपतो न व्यपदेश्यम् ।

प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढं ततोऽर्थादिति केचन—काव्या० V.6.

one of the two definitions—the first of them—belongs, on the authority of वाचस्पति मिश्र, to दिङ्नाग and the second, on the same authority, to वसुबन्धु[1], the teacher of दिङ्नाग. Now can it be imagined that भामह could have afforded to leave out धर्मकीर्ति's definition, had he been aware of it? Besides, कल्पना is defined by धर्मकीर्ति in a strikingly different way. According to him कल्पना is अभिलापसंसर्गयोग्यप्रतिभासप्रतीतिः[2]. But उद्योतकर, while discussing दिङ्नाग's definition of प्रत्यक्ष, says: 'अथ केयं कल्पना? नामजातियोजनेति। यत् किल न नाम्नाभिधीयते न च जात्यादिभिर्व्यपदिश्यते।'[3] वाचस्पतिमिश्र calls it लक्षणवादिनामुत्तरम्[4]. Now the लक्षणवादी's must be दिङ्नाग and all those who had a similar view. We may presume that भामह was also one of them—at least conversant with the view—for he says कल्पनां नामजात्यादियोजनां प्रतिजानते-काव्या० V. 6. It may be admitted that धर्मकीर्ति's definition of कल्पना is more academic in tone exactly as his definition of प्रत्यक्ष is more exact in expression. If भामह could afford to give two views on an important issue, he would not, we think, mind to give a third one also, if it was more useful and suitable, as धर्मकीर्ति's definitions indeed are.

---

[1] वाचस्पतिमिश्र begins his comment upon 'अपरे पुनर्वर्णयन्ति ततोऽर्थाद् विज्ञानं प्रत्यक्षम्। तदेवं प्रत्यक्षलक्षणं समर्थ्य वासुबन्धवं तावत् प्रत्यक्षलक्षणं विकल्पयितुमुपन्यस्यति-ता० p. 99. See also Dr. Randle's Fragments from Diṅnāga, p. 12—13.

[2] न्यायबिन्दु, p. 13.

[3] न्यायवार्तिक, p. 44.

[4] तात्पर्यटीका, p. 102.

One thing more should be noted in this connection. As far as we know, धर्मकीर्ति has nowhere in his extant works shown any regard to the views of वसुबन्धु, though his pupil, दिङ्नाग, is his great authoritative source. But भामह has referred to the views of the older logician in unmistakable language. May we not assume with probability that, by the time of धर्मकीर्ति, वसुबन्धु had been somewhat eclipsed by his decidedly abler pupil? It is quite possible that भामह lived in an age when वसुबन्धु was not so forgotten. He still commanded respectful attention from scholars along with दिङ्नाग.

It will be undoubtedly quite profitable to give here the results of a detailed comparison of these works; but we are afraid the space at our disposal will not permit it. We may, in passing, just note a few points. भामह has six पक्षाभासs[1] but धर्मकीर्ति has only four.[2] If we were to look into न्यायप्रवेश we shall find no less than nine.[3] But what is very interesting to note is that some of the definitions and examples of भामह wholly correspond with those in न्यायप्रवेश । दृष्टान्त is included by धर्मकीर्ति in त्रिरूपहेतु[4] but भामह takes it separately[5] exactly as we find it in न्यायप्रवेश and प्रमाणसमुच्चय । In न्यायप्रवेश and प्रमाणसमुच्चय we further find दृष्टान्त divided into two classes according to the way they are possible either by साधर्म्य or वैधर्म्य[6] । This is also the case with भामह । But धर्मकीर्ति has

---

1. काव्यालङ्कार, v. 13-20.
2. न्यायबिन्दु, pp. 84-85.
3. न्यायप्रवेश—See in the History of Indian Logic, pp. 290-291
4. त्रिरूपो हेतुरुक्तः । तावतैवार्थप्रतीतिरिति न पृथग् दृष्टान्तो नाम साधनावयवः कश्चित् । तेन नास्य लक्षणं पृथगुच्यते-न्यायबिन्दु, p. 117.
5. काव्यालङ्कार, v. 21, v. 26-27.
6. History of Indian Logic, pp. 286-7, 295—6. In these

no such division. The few points, noted above, are quite sufficient to convince any unprejudiced person that भामह's borrowing from धर्मकीर्ति is any thing but possible.

Even if these points were not available, we could have shown that भामह's coming after धर्मकीर्ति cannot be imagined. धर्मकीर्ति, as shown above, lived about 650 A. C. and hailed from the South of India. शान्तरक्षित lived in Bengal in the beginning of the 8th century. Now, we cannot, with any stretch of our imagination, conceive that within half a century such a progress could be possible in those days of hard communication. धर्मकीर्ति becomes sufficiently famous, his works are carried to Kashmir, there भामह utilises them for writing his own work, then he also becomes well-known, his work reaches Bengal and is devoured by शान्तरक्षित—and all this was accomplished within half a century ! It seems to be hardly possible. We have no reason, therefore, to doubt आनन्दवर्द्धन's statement that बाण was acquainted with भामह's work, so that 600 A.C. can be safely taken to be the lower limit of भामह's date.

But what should be his upper limit ? The fore-going discussion has shown that भामह was familiar with the views, which are, on the authority of वाचस्पतिमिश्र, ascribed to दिङ्नाग। We have further shown that his views sometimes correspond with those which are found in न्यायप्रवेश। Nanjio[1] and Takakusu[2] ascribe this work to नागार्जुन। But Pandit Vidhuśekhara Bhaṭṭāchārya thinks that Nanjio " has

---

cases resemblance in phraseology is also to be noted. धर्मकीर्ति has, however, got such a division in दृष्टान्ताभास.

[1] Nanjio's Catalogue of the Chinese Tripiṭaka, p. 270, Nos. 1223, 1224.

[2] A Record of the Buddhist Religion by Itsing, pp. 177, 186.

made a mistake in rendering the name into Sanskrit. The name, as given in Chinese in the book itself, is Yü luṅ, the Sanskrit equivalent of which is Diṅnāga."[1] But, according to Sugiura[2] and Ui,[3] न्यायप्रवेश is attributed by the Chinese tradition to शङ्करस्वामी । दिङ्नाग's work, according to this view, was न्यायद्वार, quite distinct from न्यायप्रवेश. Dr. Randle[4] sees 'no reason to doubt the correctness of the Chinese attribution of the न्यायद्वार to Diṅnāga. That being the case, it is impossible that Diṅnāga should have been the author of न्यायप्रवेश.' But we see no reason to doubt the correctness of the Tibetan attribution of the न्यायप्रवेश to दिङ्नाग । If that be the case, it is impossible that any other person but दिङ्नाग should have been the author of the न्यायप्रवेश । Besides many cogent arguments so ably put forward by Pandit Vidhuśekhara Bhaṭṭāchārya[5] for proving that न्यायप्रवेश was the work of दिङ्नाग, one thing appears to turn the scale to a very great extent. It is a curious fact that शङ्करस्वामी was not known to either Houen Tsang or Itsing. The Tibetan texts are quite ignorant of his name. The Tibetan translation of the Chinese translation of न्यायप्रवेश clearly shows that at that time even the Chinese did not know of शङ्करस्वामी । It is really inexplicable how they came, later on, to associate his name with न्यायप्रवेश । There seems to be some baffling confusion, lurking somewhere or other. Unless and until this mystery is cleared up, we shall not know the real ground of its attribution by the

---

[1] 'The Nyāya Praveśa of Diṅnāga,' Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. III, p. 154.

[2] Hindu Logic as preserved in China and Japan, pp. 36-37.

[3] Vaiśeṣika Philosophy, p. 68.

[4] Fragments from Diṅnāga, p. 61.

[5] Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. III, pp. 154-159.

Chinese to शङ्करस्वामी । But so far as the Tibetan Text,[1] as edited by Pandit Vidhuśekhara Bhaṭṭāchārya, is concerned, it is more than probable that it is the work of दिङ्नाग । The learned editor has compared it with the Chinese and Sanskrit Versions and does not perhaps find material difference between them. So what is said of the Tibetan version with regard to its authorship, may be, therefore, true of other versions as well.[2] We have every hope that this puzzling enigma will be cleared up by Principal Dhruva's Introduction to the Sanskrit Version of the न्यायप्रवेश[3] ।

It does not, however, matter much for us even if शङ्करस्वामी was to be proved the author of न्यायप्रवेश । He is said to have been the pupil of दिङ्नाग and consequently must have been his younger contemporary. So when we find clear resemblance of certain views and expressions in भामह's work from the works of दिङ्नाग and न्यायप्रवेश, we can, without hesitation, say that दिङ्नाग's date will furnish the upper limit to भामह's age.

The date of दिङ्नाग depends upon the date of his teacher, वसुबन्धु । Nanjio informs us that कुमारजीव wrote a life of वसुबन्धु[4] between A. C. 401 and 409 and परमार्थ, who lived between A.C. 499 and 560, wrote another.[5] From

---

[1] Gaekwad Oriental Series, XXXIX Part II.

[2] Dr. N. D. Minorov contributes a paper on 'Diṅnāga's Nyāya Praveśa and Haribhadra's commentary on it,' to the volume presented to Dr. Garbe. We have not as yet seen it, but from the title we may assume that he is also inclined to attribute न्यायप्रवेश to दिङ्नाग ।

[3] G. O. S. XXXIX Part I.

[4] Nanjio's Catalogue of the Chinese Tripiṭaka, app. I. 64.

[5] Ibid No. 1463.

परमार्थ[1] we know that वसुबन्धु was a contemporary of विक्रमादित्य, who is identified by V. A. Smith[2] with Chandra Gupta I of the Gupta Dynasty. If this line of argument is followed, as has been done by V. A. Smith[3] and M. Peri[4], वसुबन्धु, who died, it is said, at the age of 80, will be found to have been living between 280-360 A.C. But unfortunately all scholars are not at one. Different scholars assign different dates to वसुबन्धु। The other most important view is that which places him between 420—500 A. C.[5] But the majority of the scholars[6] appears to be inclined towards the former view. Undoubtedly that view appears, to say the least, much more probable. If we were to subscribe to the other view, the whole subsequent chronology becomes awfully disturbed. Then we have to look upon कुमारजीव's 'Life of Vasubandhu' as a myth and disbelieve the traditions which make वसुबन्धु one of the Patriarchs and his work as having been translated into Chinese by कुमारजीव।

So we have seen above that there is every probability of वसुबन्धु having lived between 280 and 360 A. C. Now दिङ्नाग, being his pupil, must have been his junior contemporary and so must have lived somewhere before 400. Now, if 400 A. C. is to be the approximate date of दिङ्नाग, that date must also be considered to furnish the upper limit to भामह's date. We may, therefore, safely say that भामह must have lived between the dates of दिङ्नाग and बाण, viz., between 400 and 600 A. C.

---

[1] Takakusu, J. R. A. S., 1905, p. 44.

[2] Early History of India, 3rd Edn., p. 320.

[3] Ibid, pp. 328 ff.

[4] Bull. de l.' Ecole francaise d' Extreme-orient, XI. 355 ff.

[5] Vidyābhūṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, pp. 266—267.

[6] Keith—Indian Logic and Atomism, p. 98, Buddhist Philosophy p. 155; B. Bhaṭṭacharya's Foreword to तत्त्वसंग्रह (G. O. S. XXX) pp. LXVI—LXXX.

If we wish to be a little more exact with regard to the date of भामह, we should try to find out whether he was nearer to दिङ्नाग or to धर्मकीर्ति । We have already shown that his views correspond much more with those of दिङ्नाग than those of धर्मकीर्ति । We have further shown that he was living in an age when the old teachers were not as yet forgotten. This fact can be further borne out by a careful comparison of his work with the extant works of those teachers. At some places he has referred the reader for details to other works which are not found perhaps in दिङ्नाग's works. We have further to take into consideration that भामह's fame must have taken some time for becoming so much ripe as to induce a poet of Kanouj, as बाण indeed was, to become acquainted with the work of the great Kashmirian. If we may be permitted to allow a century for it, we shall be, we thihk, not wrong in placing भामह before 500 A. C. But the way he writes, the atmosphere he breathes, the company he keeps,—all these leave us still unsatisfied. We are very much tempted to think that he was not far removed from दिङ्नाग, though we cannot positively prove it by direct evidence. The fifth chapter of his काव्यालङ्कार, teeming so much with philosophical logic, rather smacking much more, as it were, of polemics, makes us believe that he was living in an age which was permeated with debate and controversy in every quarter. Such a period in Indian History was possible only with such scholars as दिङ्नाग । We know from accounts[1], preserved here and there, that the great आचार्य spent his whole life in vehement शास्त्रार्थ—heated controversy and debate. He was known in his times as तर्कपुङ्गव or a fighting bull. But such an age did not last for a long time. By the time of दण्डी, न्यायनिर्णय or settling the logic of poetry, which was considered so very necessary an appendage in a work on Poetics by भामह, came to be considered as a useless कर्कशविचार[1] । Even in the time of बाण, we find no indication of the continuation of दिङ्नाग's age of passionate debate and heated controversy. Further, no indication to that effect has been furnished even by the 5th and 6th century inscriptions of the Guptas. Thus we are not far wrong in believing that that age of controversy almost came to an end with दिङ्नाग । Hence we may conclude that भामह was either a contemporary of or came immediately after दिङ्नाग, who, we know, became widely known throughout the country on account of his incessant wanderings on controversy tours.[2] Consequently we may state that भामह was, with all probability, living about 400 A. C. or, if न्यायप्रवेश happens to be proved the work of शंकरस्वामी, a few years later.

---

[1] Lama Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus von Schierfner, pp. 130—135; Vidyabhuṣṇa's History of Indian Logic, pp. 272-274.

भामह's WORKS

It is indeed very difficult—if not wholly impossible—to determine whether our author had written any other work besides the well-known काव्यालङ्कार । We find, no doubt, the name of भामह associated with certain quotations which are not traceable in the काव्यालङ्कार । राघवभट्ट, in his commentary, अर्थद्योतनिका, on अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तल, quotes twice in the name of भामह extracts which are nowhere to be found in the काव्यालङ्कार । One of them appears to have been taken from a work on Metrics[1] and the other from some work on Poetics[2]. The latter sentence, curiously enough, is met with, with slight modifications, in the **अलङ्कारसारसंग्रह** of **उद्भट** and its example in **काव्यप्रकाश** । Some ślokas are quoted by **नारायणभट्ट** in his commentary on **वृत्तरत्नाकर** in the name of **भामह** । These seem to have been taken from a work on Metrics[3].

---

[1] विचारः कर्कशः प्रायस्तेनालीढेन किं फलम्–काव्यादर्श

[2] Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus von Schiefner.

---

[1] क्षेमं सर्वगुरुर्दत्ते मगणो भूमिदैवतः इति भामहोक्तेः p. 4. (नि० सा० edition).

[2] तल्लक्षणमुक्तं भामहेन—पर्यायोक्तं प्रकारेण यदन्येनाभिधीयते । वाच्यवाचकशक्तिभ्यां शून्येनावगमात्मना । इति । उदाहृतं च हयग्रीववधस्थं पद्यं 'यं प्रेक्ष्य चिररूढापि निवासप्रीतिरुज्झिता । मदेनैरावणमुखे मानेन हृदये हरेः' इति । p. 10.

[3] तदुक्तं भामहेन—

अवर्णात् सम्पत्तिर्भवति मुदिवर्णाद्धनशता-
न्युवर्णादख्यातिः सरभसमृवर्णाद्धिरहितात् ।
तथा ह्येचः सौख्यं ङञणरहितादक्षरगणात्
पदादौ विन्यासात् भरवहलहाहाविरहितात् ॥

वृत्तरत्नाकर, p. 6 (Benares Edition).

तदुक्तं भामहेनैव—

देवतावाचकाः शब्दा ये च भद्रादिवाचकाः ।
ते सर्वे नैव निन्द्याः स्युर्लिपितो गणतोऽपि वा ॥
कः खो गो घश्च लक्ष्मीं वितरति वियशो ङस्तथा चः सुखं छः
प्रीतिं जो मित्रलाभं भयमरणकरौ झञौ टठौ खेददुःखे ।
डः शोभां ढो विशोभां भ्रमणमथ च णस्तः सुखं थश्च युद्धं
दो धः सौख्यं मुदं नः सुखभयमरणक्लेशदुःखं पवर्गः ॥
यो लक्ष्मीं रश्च दाहं व्यसनमथ लवौ शः सुखं षश्च खेदं
सः सौख्यं हश्च खेदं विलयमपि च लः क्षः समृद्धिं करोति ।
संयुक्तं चेह न स्यात् सुखमरणपटुर्वर्णविन्यासयोगः
पद्यादौ गद्यवक्त्रे वचसि च सकले प्राकृतादौ समोऽयम् ॥

वृत्तरत्नाकर p. 7.

Besides these extracts, coming down to us in the name of भामह, presumably taken from works now wholly lost, we have a well-known commentary on प्राकृतप्रकाश, the Prakrit Grammar written in sutras by वररुचि. It is called प्राकृतमनोरमा and is considered to be the oldest commentry now extant[1].

We have no direct evidence to prove or disprove that it was the author of काव्यालङ्कार who wrote the works referred to above. Who can say if there were not several persons bearing the same common appellation? But it is not every person bearing a similar name who is equally famous. The author of the प्राकृतमनोरमा, however, has been identified by somewith the writer of काव्यालङ्कार. Dr. Pischel[2] following Peterson[3] did not even doubt, that the two भामहs might be different. He says—" Der. alteste commentator is Bhāmaha, ein Kaschmirer, der auch Rhetor und Dichter war. " As far as we can see, their opinion seems to have been based upon the hearsay of the Pandits. Howsoever reliable their views may be, we would very much wish that they were backed by historical evidence, so that they could be pronounced as perfectly definite. But it appears at the same time simply impossible to believe that such a versatile scholar, as the author of काव्यालङ्कार seems to have been, could have remained perfectly idle before or after the writing of his brilliant work on Rhetoric. So, in a word, we do not find ourselves in a position to pronounce any definite opinion either this way or that way.

---

1. Pischel's Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen, p. 35.
2. Ibid.
3. सुभाषितावली, p. 79; See also Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum and Pischel's Rudrata p, 6 f.

काव्यालङ्कार.

We wish very much that we could discuss thoroughly and examine critically the learned and interesting contents of the काव्यालङ्कार, but the consideration of space does not permit us to enlarge upon this topic at any great length. It is enough to remember here that भामह has divided his work into six परिच्छेदs or sections treating of five topics. They are as under—

1. **काव्यशरीर**. To this section 60 verses have been devoted. They dispose of a few general questions about poetry, its use, definition, etc ;

2. **अलङ्कार**s. This topic consists of the definitions and illustrations of the Figures of Speech. It is interesting to meet here with a few names of poets who are now wholly unknown. This portion covers 160 verses ;

3. **दोष**s. Here भामह discusses the demerits of poetic compositions in 50 verses ;

4. **न्यायनिर्णय**—Here he tries to settle the logical foundation of poetry. Really speaking, this section and the section following form parts of the discussions on the demerits of compositions. But as Logic and Grammar appear to have been reigning supreme in his days, the author was led to devote, unlike many others, special sections to them. This section has for its share 70 verses ;

5. **शब्दशुद्धि**—Here the author tries to instruct the would-be poets to take care of and avoid the grammatical mistakes which are ever so prone to creep in. This section has 60 verses[1].

---

[1] भामह himself has summed up the whole thing at the end of his काव्यालङ्कार—

षष्ट्या शरीरं निर्णीतं शतषष्ट्या त्वलङ्कृतिः।
पञ्चाशता दोषदृष्टिः सप्तत्या न्यायनिर्णयः ॥

भामह—HIS PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF SANSKRIT POETICS.

We have seen, at the very outset, in what a great esteem भामह has all along been held by almost all the great writers on Sanskrit Poetics. He is found quoted in the works of उद्भट, वामन, कुन्तक, आनन्दवर्धन, अभिनवगुप्त, मम्मट and many others of different times and divergent views. With equal regard he has been often referred to by such writers of eminence as the authors of अलङ्कारसर्वस्व, प्रतापरुद्रीय, एकावली and others[1]. This fact cannot but rouse a sense of inquisitiveness in our hearts to study the work of भामह as thoroughly as to find out his merits of such a stable and enduring attraction. But this is not an easy thing as it will necessitate a thorough review of the important Ālaṁkārika works for comparison as well as for tracing their indebtedness to our poetician. But the consideration of this topic may find a fitting place in a History of Sanskit Poetics and not in a paper like this. All that we can do is to take a brief historical survey of our subject and determine as correctly as possible the place occupied therein by भामह ।

षष्ट्या शब्दस्य शुद्धिः स्यादित्येवं वस्तुपञ्चकम् ।
उक्तं षड्भिः परिच्छेदैर्भामहेन क्रमेण वः ॥

For the detailed description of the contents, see Kāṇe's Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, pp. XVI–XVII ; for a critical review of the contents the reader is referred to Trivedi's excellent paper "Some Notes on Bhāmaha" in Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume and Dr. De's History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. II, pp. 401—412.

[1] For such details see Trivedi's article in Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLII (1913) and also his Introduction to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण.

The worship of सरस्वती—the service of the Poetic Muse—has been from very early times one of the favourite hobbies of the Aryan people. Even the oldest attempt at poetry by the primeval ancestors of the human race—the ऋग्वेद—contains many sparkling gems of genuine poetry. It appears that the Aryans had undoubtedly an artistic conception of poetry from the very beginning, for we meet even in the earliest poems, with expressions of such exquisite aesthetic charm as have been later on elaborately treated of in the works of Poetics as अलङ्कारs or figures of speech[1].

We find a treatment of उपमा in the निरुक्त of यास्क[2], who, at one place, refers to a quite workable definition of this figure given by गार्ग्य[3] । यास्क gives further such divisions of उपमा[4] which seem to have been the fore-runners of the subtle distinctions made later on. By the time of पाणिनि such technical words as उपमान, उपमेय etc. had become perfectly well-established[5]. We find further a reference to

---

1. See ऋग्वेद I. 124. 7 ; I. 164. 20 ; I. 164. 11. See also कठोपनिषत् I. 3. 3. and मुण्डकोनिषत् II 2 3. Besides these, we may also refer to the several hymns containing charming dialogues, known as संवाद hymns found in the ऋग्वेद. See especially X. 108 ; III. 33. These hymns have been considered as the fore-runners of the Sanskrit Drama by Dr. Oldenberg and others.
2. I. 4 ; III. 13-18 ; IX. 6.
3. अथात उपमा यदतत् तत्सदृशमिति गार्ग्यः । तदासां कर्म ज्यायसा वा गुणेन प्रख्याततमेन वा कनीयांसं वाप्रख्यातं वोपमिमीते, अथापि कनीयसा ज्यायांसम् । —निरुक्त, III. 13.
4. III. 13-18; IX. 6.
5. See पाणिनि's अष्टाध्यायी II. 1. 55-56.; II. 3. 72.

नटसूत्रs in the grammer of पाणिनि[1] which, whatever their character, must have had something to do with the actors. Further, tradition credits पाणिनि with the authorship of two महाकाव्यs known as पातालविजय and जाम्बवती विजय[2] though, it is still an open question whether the Gramarian and the Poet were one and the same[3]. From the वार्तिक of कात्यायन it is evident that such a division of काव्य as आख्यायिका had already come into existence[4]. पतञ्जलि, the author of the महाभाष्य on Panini's Sutras, has fortunately left many clues by which one can safely surmise that literary activities had been the characteristic of that age. He refers to one महाकाव्य[5] three आख्यायिकाs[6] and two नाटकs[7] by name, besides many quotations and references of undoubted literary significance[8].

These early grammatical works, as we have seen above do not fail to make us infer that the secular literature had begun to thrive somewhat luxuriantly even in the early periods of our ancient history. We find additional support to this hypothesis from the रामायण and the महाभारत which

---

1. पाराशर्यशिलालिभ्यां भिक्षुनटसूत्रयेाः, IV. 3. 110. ; कर्मन्द-कृशाश्वादिनिः, IV. 3. 111.
2. Winternitz : Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, Vol. III. p. 32.
3. Dr. Peterson : JBRAS, XVII (1889), 57ff, J.R.A.S. 1891, 311. ff ; Pischel : ZDMG, 39, (1885) 95 ff.; R.G. Bhandarkar, JBRAS, XVI, 344.
4. लुबाख्यायिकाभ्यो बहुलम् on the सूत्र, अधिकृत्य कृते ग्रन्थे ।
5. यत्तेन कृतं न च तेन प्रोक्तं वाररुचं काव्यम् । महाभाष्य Vol. II,p 315.
6. They are वासवदत्ता, सुमनोत्तरा and भैमरथी. महाभाष्यVol .II. p. 313.
7. ये तावदेते शोभनिका नामैते प्रत्यक्षं कृष्णं घातयन्ति,
प्रत्यक्षं च बलिं बन्धयन्तीति । Vol II, p. 34 and 36.
8. Indian Historical Quarterly Vol II. pp. 464—470

contain a very large number of highly poetic passages. Some of these are found quoted in the later authoritative works on Poetics[1].

The रामायण can be considered as a काव्य both from its form and its matter. It is deservedly called an आदिकाव्य Various dates have been assigned to these two epics by different scholars. Dr. Jacobi places रामायण in the 6th century B.C[2]. The अर्थशास्त्र of कौटिल्य contains a number of references which clearly prove the existence of literary activities in his days[3].

It is not conceivable that with the writing of so much poetry, no speculation about the nature, function, division of poetry could have been going on side by side. That we are not wrong in indulging in such an inference can be clearly made out by looking into the काव्यs and नाटकs of अश्वघोष[4] and by the inscriptions dating 2nd century on wards.

---

[1] See ध्वन्यालोक, pp. 63, 125, 238 and काव्यप्रकाश, उल्लास IV

[2] Dr. Jacobi : Das Ramayana

[3] See Winternitz : Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, Bd. III. p. 369. See also अर्थशास्त्र (Jolly and Schmidt's Edn. p. 145 f.

[4] The contents of his works fully bear out the supposition that he was conversant with the dicta of अलङ्कारशास्त्र. His काव्यs are divided into सर्गs which, as required, have different metres in the end. His fragmentary dramatic work is called by himself a प्रकरण, just as his two extant काव्यs are styled as महाकाव्यs. These few points along with many other minor ones, are quite significant in the case of a Buddhist preacher. For details see Kāṇe-Indian Antiquary 1912, p. 127 ; also Winternitz—Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, Vol. III, pp. 33, 34.

The inscriptions of रुद्रदामन्[1] which may be considered beyond doubt the earliest of such literary inscriptions betray both from their form and contents their acquaintance with speculations on Poetics. Though no work has actually come down to us, we can find out from the नाट्यशास्त्र of भरत[2] and decidedly from काव्यालङ्कार of भामह[3] that a very large number of the writers on the subject had already contributed their quota for formulating regular theories of Poetics and Dramaturgy. It is not possible to determine with perfect satisfaction as to which of the two—Poetics and Dramaturgy—preceded the other. There seems to be, however, some probability that the Dramaturgy

---

1. See Epigraphica Indica Vol. VIII. 36. The inscription which is most useful for our purpose is found at Junagarh and dated 150 A.C. It is not only written in a poetic style of a high merit but contains many words and phrases which clearly betray their unmistakable acquaintance with some extinct works on Poetics. The following few words may be taken by way of specimen. सर्वक्षत्राविष्कृतवीरशब्दजातोत्सेकाविधेयानां यौधेयानां प्रसह्योत्सादकेन···शब्दार्थगान्धर्वन्यायाद्यानां विद्यानां महतीनां पारणधारणविज्ञानप्रयोगावाप्तविपुलकीर्तिना·········स्फुटलघुमधुरचित्रकान्तशब्दसमयोदारालङ्कृतगद्यपद्य···स्वयमधिगतमहाक्षत्रपनाम्ना नरेन्द्रकन्यास्वयंवरानेकमाल्यप्राप्तदाम्ना महाक्षत्रपेण रुद्रदाम्ना। In this connection the Gupta Inscriptions are also of great interest.
2. The present text, even though going by the name of भरत, scarcely seems to be the work of one man. Its contents betray frequent handling and rehandling and the incorporation of matters by persons of different dates. See P. R. Bhāndārkar—Indian Antiquary Vol. XLI ; Kāṇe—Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLVI.
3. Trivedi—Introduction to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण and Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLII.

went somewhat ahead of Poetics. The conception of a complete poetry was primarily essentially dramatic[1] and consequently Rhetoric proper fell within the folds of Dramaturgy[2]. But with the growth of literature, काव्य could not always remain subservient to drama. It claimed an independent consideration for itself, so that in course of time it began to include dramas within its own folds[3].

The history of Sanskrit Poetics can, therefore, he conveniently studied in these three stages, viz., (i) the first stage when the consideration of Rhetoric fell under Dramaturgy, (ii) the second stage when the two claimed independently separate considerations[4], (iii) the third stage when Dramaturgy came to be considered under Poetics. The first stage was characterised by the simple and the crude speculations as is quite natural for a growing science at its outset. The third stage covers the period of speculative elaboration and consequently of a relative perfection[5].

---

[1] See नाट्यशास्त्र, XVI, 118 (काव्यमाला Edition). The theory is upheld by वामन in his काव्यालङ्कारसूत्र I. 3. 30-32 and अभिनवगुप्त in his अभिनवभारती (Chapter VI) where he says—काव्यं तावन्मुख्यतो दशरूपकात्मकमेव।·········सर्गबन्धादौ हि नायिकाया अपि संस्कृतैवोक्तिरित्यादि बहुतरमनुचितम् ।

[2] The काव्य may be taken to be, according to भरत, one of the four constituents of a drama. It is called पाठ्यम् and is said to have been derived from ऋग्वेद । See नाट्यशास्त्र I, 17. It is for this reason that दोषs, गुणs, अलङ्कारs etc. claim only a partial treatment in the नाट्यशास्त्र । See नाट्यशास्त्र अध्याय XVI.

[3] अग्निपुराण, Chapter 337 and साहित्यदर्पण परिच्छेद VI.

[4] See भामह's काव्यालङ्कार I. 24.

[5] Really speaking the conception of रस may be taken to be the determining factor of these various stages. It was at first thought that complete रसानुभूति was possible from only a dramatic work by way of a combined effect of dialogues, songs

It was in the second stage that the real formative work was undertaken and accomplished.[1] This stage can be further considered under two sub-stages, the first of which had much to do with speculations on what is called the शरीर and the second on the आत्मा of poetry. It was आनन्दवर्धनाचार्य, the well-known poetician of Kāshmir, who initiated and laid a firm foundation of the theory about the आत्मा of poetry, namely, ध्वनि।

We have no data to determine the name and time of the author who, for the first time, undertook a scientific study of the शरीर of poetry. We may, however, claim

---

and acting. The काव्य, even after becoming a little more independently popular, could only be thought as generating the चमत्कार of शब्द and अर्थ and not of रस। This explains why we miss the treatment of रस in the works of भामह, दण्डी, वामन and others. But with the advent of the ध्वनि School of आनन्दवर्धन, a new conception of रस stepped in and decided the fate of the later development. The रस was no more to be thought of as कार्य or ज्ञाप्य by means of a dramatic action but as व्यङ्ग्य, being suggested primarily by the words themselves. See अभिनवभारती on नाट्यशास्त्र (Chapter VI).

[1] The histrionic considerations had such an upperhand over other elements that the writers in the first stage could devote neither time nor attention to a detailed study of काव्य। Theatrical managements and stage arrangements along with the treatment of अभिनय and संगीत in all their elaborately worked-out details, could neither allow them much space nor time for anything else. It has been quite natural in the growth of every science and art that as soon as it becomes liberated from a subordinate position under its genre, it begins to claim attention from all sides and consequently to achieve wide ramifications. Such has also been the case with our काव्य।

from the evidence of the later writers of note that the great exponent of such rhetorical speculations was no other person than the great भामह himself. There is no doubt that a number of writers on this subject[1] preceded भामह but perhaps the quality of their work as shown by the negligence shown to them by even the earlier writers of subsequent times, did not reach a very high water-mark. And it is quite natural. We cannot expect to find that scientific treatment in the infancy of a subject which becomes a necessary characteristic of it as it gradually develops. So we should not be wrong, if, from the reverence shown to भामह and negligence to his predecessors, we were to infer that the first work on Poetics written on a strictly scientific plan was that of भामह । He seems to have judiciously assimilated the material available in the writings[2] of his predecessors and with the help of a creative genius which he undoubtedly possessed, arranged them on a sound basis with due elaboration and fitting limitation. The employment of this method has been in his case, as shown by the result, an unqualified success. The views which he held, the theories which he propounded, mostly stood the test of time and criticism to such an extent that they were later on upheld by the greatest masters of the subject.

---

[1] भामह refers to रामशर्मा in काव्या०, II. 19, 58, to मेधावी in II 40, 88, to शाखवर्धन II. 47. We meet with a number of names which have been referred to as high authorities on Poetics in the काव्यमीमांसा of राजशेखर । Some of them are these—सुरानन्द, श्यामदेव, आपराजिति, द्रौहिणि and आनन्द । No work has come down to us under their names.

[2] भामह refers to अच्युतोत्तर of रामशर्मा in II. 19, 58, to राजमित्र of शाखवर्धन in II. 45, III. 10 and to an anonymous work called रत्नाहरण in III. 8.

It will not be, we think, out of place to take this opportunity and point out the salient features of भामह's work by referring to a few instances of such a nature.

The definition of poetry (काव्य) has all along been a matter of great controversy with the writers on Sanskrit Poetics. The easiest and the most convenient expression for denoting what broadly speaking काव्य represents has been given by भामह which is शब्दार्थौ काव्यम्[1] । It is given by मम्मट[2], the author of काव्यप्रकाश, with certain qualifications. It is in fact in these qualifications[3] that the germs of divergence, which different schools of Poetics show in point of views they propound, exist.

The same observatition may be made with regard to the divison of गुणs. The गुणs as given in भरत's नाट्यशास्त्र[4] as also in the काव्यादर्श of दण्डी[5] are ten in number. वामन[6] doubles the number by assigning them both to शब्द and अर्थ । But all the later poeticians of note have had only three गुणs including all the others in them[7]. But the first person who could point out that the three गुणs—माधुर्य, ओजस् and प्रसाद्—were all-in-all was भामह[8] । There has been no doubt,

---

[1] काव्यालङ्कार I. 16.

[2] काव्यप्रकाश Chapter I.

[3] See समुद्रबन्ध's commentary on अलङ्कारसर्वस्व p. 4 (Trivendrum Edn.) He writes thus...विशिष्टौ शब्दार्थौ काव्यम् । तद् वैशिष्ट्यं धर्ममुखेन, व्यापारमुखेन, व्यङ्ग्यमुखेनेति त्रयः पक्षाः etc.

[4] नाट्यशास्त्र p. 211 (Benares Edn.).

[5] काव्यादर्श Chapter I.

[6] काव्यालङ्कारसूत्र

[7] See काव्यप्रकाश Chapter VIII, साहित्यदर्पण Chapter VIII.

[8] काव्यालङ्कार II. 1-3.

.e difference of opinion[1] regarding the meaning of these words but as far as the comprehensiveness of the division is concerned भामह's views has stood well.

The next thing which we are to note in this connection is the consideration of वक्रोक्ति by भामह । वक्रोक्ति has played an important part in the history of Sanskrit Poetics. If we were to take into consideration the various modes and forms which वक्रोक्ति has assumed in different times, it may be said to have a history of its own. It was indeed कुन्तक who made much of वक्रोक्ति and founded a new school by writing his वक्रोक्तिजीवित [2] । But as for as our knowledge goes, भामह has been the first person to speak of वक्रोक्ति । वक्रोक्ति, as treated of by भामह [3], has not exactly the same signification as it had with कुन्तक but he was undoubtedly the fore-runner of कुन्तक in recognising it at least as a vital element of poetic compositions[4].

The few instances cited above will be, it is believed, sufficient to convince any intelligent person of the high ability and genuine originality of भामह's expositions. This conviction is brought home to us with greater insistence by his clear statements [5] that he duly exercised his critical intelligence before he wrote any thing. Coupled with this high sense of real scholarship, he had, as is evident from his examples, Poetic powers of no mean order. It is indeed a rare combination that a person is gifted with profound scholarship, sound critical acumen, and with the abilities of a clear-headed logician, a clever grammarian and above all a master poet. There is no wonder, therefore, that all the writers on Sanskrit Poetics—including even the humble writers of this humble paper—should bow down their heads with a heart full of deep reverence and grateful appreciation before such an august personality.

---

[1] See काव्यप्रकाश, Chapter VIII.

[2] Two Chapters of this work have been ably edited by Dr. S. K. De in Calcutta Oriental Series.

[3] काव्यालङ्कार, II. 85.

[4] For detailed information about वक्रोक्ति, see the learned Introduction of Dr. S. K. De to वक्रोक्तिजीवित ।

[5] काव्यालङ्कार, III. 58, VI. 64.